Writing Poems for the Paper: Documenting the Cultural Life of the German Minority in Czechoslovakia after 1945

D i s s e r t a t i o n
zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

Doctor philosophiae
(Dr. phil.)

eingereicht an der

Philosophischen Fakultät

der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Institut für Bibliotheks- und Informationswissenschaft

von
Dale Askey

Die Präsidentin der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Dr. Sabine Kunst
Die Dekanin der Philosophischen Fakultät
Prof. Dr. Gabriele Metzler

Erstgutachter: Prof. Michael Seadle, PhD
Zweitgutachterin: Prof. Lynne Tatlock, PhD

Datum der Einreichung: 09.01.2018 Datum der Promotion: 16.02.2018

Erklärung über die selbstständige Abfassung meiner Dissertation

Hiermit erkläre ich, Dale Askey, Matrikel-Nr: 588304, dass ich die vorliegende Dissertation selbstständig und ohne Benutzung anderer als der angegebenen Hilfsmittel angefertigt habe.

Die aus fremden Quellen direkt oder indirekt übernommenen Gedanken sind als solche kenntlich gemacht.

Die Dissertation wurde bisher in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form keiner anderen Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegt oder veröffentlicht.

Hamilton, Ontario, Kanada, den 6. Dezember 2017

Dale Askey

Abstract

At the conclusion of the Second World War, a reconstituted Czechoslovakia expelled the majority of its German population. A small community of 200,000-300,000 remained behind, consisting mainly of individuals with specialized trades or skills, in mixed marriages, and/or with antifascist credentials. For various reasons, many related to Cold War political realities and endemic anti-German discrimination in Czechoslovakia, these individuals largely disappeared from view. The expelled Sudeten Germans rapidly assimilated into post-war German society, in the process forming an influential and politically active interest group that cast a further shadow over the Germans who remained behind. Although well less than 10% of the pre-war German population remained, this community attempted to reestablish an active cultural life. Demands for the right to express their culture began immediately after the expulsions and persisted until the fall of Communism in 1989 and beyond.

In this dissertation I address two questions related to the cultural aspirations of this small community. First, I explore whether it is possible to document the community's attempts to maintain a German cultural identity by tracking their literary efforts. Despite restrictions on publication, it emerged that the community did actively produce literature. I recorded these texts in a bibliography that offers an entry point for further research on the German minority. The other question delves into constructing an analysis of the broader cultural politics of this community. By virtue of close engagement with the community's newspaper while searching for literature, it was possible to trace the arc of these developments, in particular the impact of changes set in motion by the Slánský trial, the Prague Spring, and the period known as Normalization. The presentation of this material here addresses a significant lacuna in research on this community.

The dissertation concludes with a chapter where I pursue the question of the extent to which the practices and policies of research libraries enable and thwart research on marginal communities. I reflect on the gap between libraries' claim to be neutral organizations and the impact of human decisions and biases on collections and offer some concluding suggestions for changes that would help libraries address critical gaps in the human record.

Zusammenfassung

Am Ende des zweiten Weltkriegs hat die wiederhergestellte Tschechoslowakei die Mehrheit ihrer deutschen Bevölkerung vertrieben. Eine kleine Gemeinschaft von 200,000-300,000 blieben im Lande, die überwiegend aus Menschen bestand, die über benötigte industriellen Fachkenntnissen verfügten, in Mischehen lebten und/oder antifaschistische Aktivitäten nachweisen konnten. Aus verschiedenen Gründen, oft verbunden mit den politischen Realitäten des kalten Kriegs und der vorherrschenden antideutschen Diskriminierung in der Tschechoslowakei, verschwanden diese Menschen aus dem Blickfeld der Geschichte. Die vertriebenen Sudetendeutsche integrierten sich schnell in die deutsche Nachkriegsgesellschaft; im Laufe dieser Integration bildeten sie eine einflussreiche und politisch engagierte Interessengruppe, die einen weiteren Schatten über die verbliebenen Deutsche warf. Obwohl weit weniger als 10% der deutschen Vorkriegsbevölkerung vorhanden war, versuchte diese Gruppe von Verbliebenen ein aktives kulturelles Leben wiederherzustellen. Der Anspruch auf das Recht, ihre Kultur pflegen zu dürfen, wurde gleich nach der Vertreibung erhoben und dauerte bis zum Ende des Kommunismus und weiterhin an.

In dieser Dissertation gehe ich zwei Fragen nach, die mit den kulturellen Bestrebungen dieser kleinen Gemeinschaft verbunden sind. Zuerst erforsche ich, ob es möglich ist, durch die Auffindung ihrer literarischen Bestrebungen, das Bemühen dieser Gemeinschaft ihre kulturelle Identität zu bewahren zu dokumentieren. Trotz der Einschränkung von Veröffentlichungsmöglichkeiten, wurde es klar, dass die Gemeinschaft literarisch tätig war. Ihre Texte habe ich in eine Bibliographie eingetragen, die Anhaltspunkte für weiterführende Forschung zu dieser Gemeinschaft bietet. Die zweite Frage nimmt die Erstellung einer Analyse des generellen kulturpolitischen Umfelds der Gemeinschaft auf sich. Durch die sorgfältige Lektüre der Gemeinschaftszeitung auf der Suche nach literarischen Beiträgen, war es möglich den Verlauf dieser Entwicklungen zu verfolgen, insbesondere die Auswirkung der Veränderungen, die von dem Slánský-Prozess, dem Prager Frühling und der Normalisierung ausgelöst wurden. Die Darstellung dieser Materialien hier schließt eine wesentliche Lücke in der Forschung zu dieser Gemeinschaft.

Im letzten Kapitel dieser Dissertation biete ich eine Reflexion zur Frage inwiefern Bibliothekspraxis und –politik ermöglichen sowie verhindern die Erforschung von

Randgemeinschaften und -themen. Ich behandle die Diskrepanz zwischen den Neutralitätsbehauptungen von Bibliotheken und der Auswirkung von menschlichen Entscheidungen und Neigungen auf Bestände und biete abschließend Vorschläge für Veränderungen, die es Bibliotheken ermöglichen würden, kritische Lücken in der Überlieferung vom menschlichen Wissen anzugehen.

Acknowledgements

I owe a debt of gratitude to many individuals who helped me bring this research project from an idea to a completed dissertation. That this work spanned nearly twenty years presents me with some challenges as I attempt to reconstruct events and interactions now long past; I beg forgiveness of anyone whom I fail to credit.

Two individuals supported me from the beginning to the end and require special recognition. First, my wife, Dr. Jennifer Askey, who has always been my best and most supportive critic and friend. Her logistical, intellectual, and motivational assistance has been gracious and expert. Prof. Dr. Gerhard Hacker has also been there since the beginning of this project, writing one of the letters of support for the original funding application that surely led to its success. His friendship and advice has made this all seem achievable.

I particularly thank Gerd and his wife, Lucia Hacker, for generously hosting me for a portion of my research leave in 2017 as I wrote these chapters. The time I spent working in "her" library at the University of Leipzig was invaluable, as were our afternoon coffee breaks where she repeatedly rescued me from various writing traps.

Although I may never forgive him for finishing his doctorate a year ahead of me, I am grateful to Dr. Kenning Arlitsch for doing so, as it gave me hope that I could do this and strong motivation to finish. He and his wife, Dr. Deborah Keil, also opened their home to me during my research leave, enabling me to create the perfect writer's retreat. I look forward to many more visits that combine hard work with outdoor adventures. Kenning and Dr. Stephanie Krueger earn a special place in my heart for their encouragement and for blazing the Humboldt bureaucratic trail on my behalf. I am glad not to be lost in those woods.

Dr. Michael Seadle has my sincere gratitude, first for suggesting that I consider writing my dissertation with him at the Humboldt University, then for recognizing long before I would have that my initial topic was simply not going to work. I neglected to see the potential in the research I had done earlier, but his encouragement to revisit it has proven to be a sage piece of advice. Dr. Lynne Tatlock, as my second reader, has been utterly critical to its completion. Her close reading and sharp eye have surely made it a far more lucid and readable text, but it is her support for my career direction and her intellectual guidance that I value far more. She first opened the door to graduate study for me, so it seems only fitting that she is here at the conclusion, a generation later.

I extend my gratitude to the staff at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, the research library at the Collegium Carolinum in Munich, and the Archive of the City of Ústí nad Labem. Without their assistance and collections, this research would have been impossible. I also thank the staff at my current employer, the McMaster University Library, for their expert interlibrary loan work on my behalf. They worked several minor miracles, sparing me an entire trip to Prague. Particular thanks go to my colleagues and managers who ably filled my shoes while I was out on research leave: Anne Pottier, Wade Wyckoff, Jason Brodeur, John Fink, David Kemper, David Kidney, Chris McAllister, Gabriela Mircea, and Rhonda Moore. Please let me return the favour someday. My boss and University Librarian at McMaster, Vivian Lewis, has been nothing but supportive and endlessly patient as I have laboured to bring this project to its end.

Ingrid Pavel, long-time journalist at and the last editor of *Die Prager Volkszeitung*, has been generous and gracious to me from the start of this project to the present day. Our conversations unlocked many mysteries and her deep knowledge of personalities and events enriched my understanding immensely. She helped me see the personal and human dimension behind the texts. I am also grateful to Dora Müller, Lenka Reinerová, and Bertl Hannich, members of the Verbliebene community who spoke with me, quite literally in their last years of life. I wish I had met them much earlier.

The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) generously funded the original research project in 1998-1999. The DAAD staff were incredibly helpful and creative. I am also grateful for the financial support of the Coutts Nijhoff West European Study Grant, which funded a research trip in 2006.

Last, I am eternally indebted to Shannon Argentati, Tina DuBois, Dirk Baay, Armin Wishard, Horst Richardson, Richard Koc, and Ursula Ziebarth, none of whom have anything to do directly with this research or dissertation. They are, in order, the high school teachers and university faculty who opened my mind to the German language. It all began with nothing more than a casual conversation in a grade nine high school counselor's office, but learning German has been a rewarding and life-shaping journey.

Table of Contents

Note

The dataset containing the bibliography of literary contributions is available via Scholars Portal Dataverse at https://dx.doi.org/10.14289/1.0000016.

Abbreviations

AuF	*Aufbau und Frieden*
CRL	Center for Research Libraries
CSSR	Czechoslovak Socialist Republic
FRG	Federal Republic of Germany
GDR	German Democratic Republic
ICON	International Coalition on Newspapers
KSČ	Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (Komunistická strana Československa)
KV	Kulturverband der Deutschen in der ČSSR, later Kulturverband der Bürger der ČSSR deutscher Nationalität, now Kulturverband der Bürger deutscher Nationalität in der Tschechischen Republik
LV	Landesversammlung der Deutschen in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien, now Landesversammlung der deutschen Vereine in der Tschechischen Republik
NSDAP	Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei
OCR	Optical character recognition
PVz	*(Die) Prager Volkszeitung*
SdP	Sudetendeutsche Partei
SL	Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft

To Jennifer, for your steadfast love, infinite patience, and expert guidance.

To my daughters Greta and Ingrid, for being a source of great joy and inspiration. May this accomplishment in turn inspire you to set your own high goals, even if they take twenty years to realize. I love you both and cannot wait to see where your lives take you.

Introduction

Finding My Topic

In 1995, after a summer stint teaching English in Slovakia, my future wife and I decided to visit a friend of hers serving in the United States Peace Corps in Bucharest, Romania. While there, we took a side trip to Transylvania, during which we visited Biertan / Birthälm, a small agricultural village near Sighişoara / Schäßburg. As with most of the previously German-majority municipalities in Transylvania, Biertan was already largely empty after the massive wave of German emigration triggered by the fall of Communism and the Ceaușescu regime. It was already clear, within half a decade, that the German exodus had deprived small communities such as Biertan of a sustaining cultural and social component.

This phenomenon of mass German exodus was not new to me, but I had rarely seen its effects firsthand at the source. Living in Germany in the wake of reunification in 1990, I experienced the influx of ethnic Germans from many nations of Central and Eastern Europe. While Germans flowed from those countries into the Federal Republic in a steady but modest stream during the decades of the Cold War, the numbers seen in the early 1990s brought to mind the staggering numbers that arrived in the wake of the Second World War, when various nations expelled large portions of their German populations. Due to the increasingly stable economic and political conditions that developed in the late 1940s and early 1950s in the Federal Republic, the experiences of the expellees both during and after their expulsion are comparatively well documented, not least given the existence of myriad expellee associations with considerable political and economic clout. Similarly, the fate of those who left the east under far less dangerous and traumatic circumstances in the late 1980s and 1990s is also relatively well documented given the orderly response to their arrival and their relatively rapid assimilation into the culture and economy of the Federal Republic.

What tends to get lost in these waves of emigration is the fate of those who were not expelled in the 1940s or could not or chose not to emigrate in the 1990s. While in Biertan, we met Germans who remained. They seemed isolated and somewhat disoriented by the world in which they now found themselves. They continued to maintain and express their German identity, but in a situation where it must have been evident to them that the German community had no viable future. As humans, we understand intuitively that no

expulsion, even the most horrific acts of genocide or ethnic cleansing, is ever complete. Given the fluidity of ethnic identity, multilingualism, and the complex webs of human relationships, a small community remains behind, struggling to survive in what is often a hostile environment.

It seems unnecessary to assert that expulsions by any name or method are traumatic for the individuals who experience them. During such moments, documenting one's community and history takes a much lower priority than daily survival and adaptation. This is true both for those expelled as well as for those who remain behind. In particular, those that remain behind must find a way to make a living in an environment where their former titles and status likely no longer hold sway. They will also typically face enormous pressure from the groups who carried out the expulsion to assimilate into the dominant culture. In such scenarios, one cannot expect to find curated archives of documents within the community. Generally speaking, our attention—as nations, as scholars, as humans—follows those who have been expelled, while the rump communities that remain behind slowly drift out of view. The case of the community I study and present here exemplifies this phenomenon.

My interest originated in wanting to understand better the situation for the Germans living outside Germany's post-war borders who escaped the fate of most of their ethnic kin in 1945 and remained in other Central and Eastern European nations. In 1998-99, a research grant from the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) enabled me to explore methods of documenting the existence of these German minority populations. The specific facet I chose to emphasize given my educational background was the general question of whether these post-expulsion communities had attempted to reassert their cultural identity in ways that can be identified and documented. Specifically, I sought to locate and catalogue their published literary expressions: poems, stories, essays, novels, or any other literary genre. Not only would the mere existence of such texts demonstrate cultural ambitions, the texts themselves would present various analytical possibilities.

These regions were not terra nova for me. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, I spent a considerable amount of time in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Romania. As a German speaker, I was struck both by the number of older individuals who spoke German as well as by the obvious presence of traces of the German past, particularly in cities such as Wrocław / Breslau or Liberec / Reichenberg. The dramatic redrawing of Poland's borders

after 1945 and the concomitant westward shift of Germans and Poles explained why Silesia and Pomerania had been German territories but were now considered Polish. One could see this change plainly on a simple map. Yet in other locations outside the former German Reich borders, the German legacy was often just as significant but, at least for a North American, less clear in origin.

In the lands that ultimately formed the centre of my research, namely the border regions of the Czech Republic, the scars and ghosts of the German past persist to this day. On a 2006 research trip, I had the opportunity to tour the region north of Jablonec nad Nisou / Gablonz. By that time, my research had sharpened my ability to see and to interpret German influence and presence. In every village or town I visited, the absence of the German population could be acutely felt although over sixty years had passed since the end of the war. I also encountered elderly expellees visiting from Germany, many of whom were children or youth at the time of the expulsion. The lack of understanding and compassion between them and their Czech hosts was palpable. As a German speaker with a German-plated rental car, the reception that I received in these regions was often cold and dismissive, shifting markedly if and when my Czech interlocutor discovered that I was not, in fact, German.

I recount my journey to this topic and my personal engagement with it for two purposes. First, I have often been asked how I found my way to such an obscure topic. More importantly, given the politically charged nature of the expulsions and the unresolved questions of guilt and complicity on all sides, I feel it is appropriate to acknowledge and address my own bias and position with regard to the topic. Eagle Glassheim, a North American historian who also researches Czech-German relations and whose work influenced my thinking, feels that it is imperative for scholars to share the personal context in which they do their research. By doing so, “we acknowledge that the questions we ask and the stories we choose to tell are a product of our own time, place, and position in society” (2016, 180).

I have no personal connection to any aspect of this story. The German heritage in my family history dates from the nineteenth century and we know few details. I am neither the child nor the grandchild of an expellee nor someone who remained behind. Yet, I would be disingenuous to assert that due to this lack of personal involvement I do not bring my own biases to this topic. When I embarked on this research, I felt motivated to tell the story of a

"forgotten" people. At the time, I thought of them mainly as victims of a horrible crime at the hands of Czechs. Similarly, I tended to view the expellees and their political organizations suspiciously, assuming as do many that they all shared guilt for the Nazi atrocities, whether as perpetrators, collaborators, or simply as obedient observers.

In hindsight, both perceptions were not only incorrect, but beyond that they rested on assumptions that themselves require interrogation. I still do believe that the expulsion of most of the German population of Czechoslovakia, as it was carried out, was criminal in nature and gratuitously inhumane. It is encouraging that we are seeing, at long last, a shift in Czech society to accept this notion and to discuss it openly. At the same time, however, I have come to see the expulsions in their historical context and am at a loss, as are many others, to suggest how things could have gone differently in 1945 following years of German barbarity. While I still view the Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft with skepticism and some measure of distaste, I now realize that their membership is not all revanchist or intent on holding Czech-German political relations hostage with their personal agenda. As the generation who experienced expulsion firsthand passes from the scene, I feel the need to recognize and remember their stories of loss and grief.

As I document in the subsequent chapters, much of the writing on Czech-German relations stems from scholars and journalists who often have far more direct personal connections to the events and processes they describe. What I contribute to this discourse is information that largely leaves out questions of right or wrong and instead focuses on letting the individuals at the centre of the story come to the fore, providing details and a narrative that allows us to see them and understand their lived experience.

Aims of this Dissertation

I divide my topic into four main chapters that address three main research questions. In the first chapter, I lay out the research questions:

- To what extent can one document the attempts made by the Czechoslovak German community left behind after the expulsions of 1945-1946 to maintain a cultural presence by documenting their literary production?
- What insights can this documentation give us about the cultural politics within the German community and the impact of Czechoslovak government policy toward minorities on the German minority?
- How do the practices and policies of libraries and archives influence this type of scholarship?

In addition to providing a review of the literature, this chapter also discusses the methodologies used for this work, which I describe as primarily bibliographic, ethnographic, and historical. I also propose the concept of ethnographic bibliography and explain its application to my research. This initial chapter includes a definition of my target population and offers notes on terminology.

The second chapter provides an overview of the long history of Czech-German relations, a centuries-long saga. Without this background, it would be difficult to understand the context in which the Germans who were not expelled found themselves. Much of the scholarship on this relationship has been written by Czech and German scholars who often have personal and visceral connections to their work. As such, one of the challenges I address with this overview is crafting a narrative that avoids some of the negative tendencies one finds in this scholarship, not least with regard to the statistical accounting of expellees, victims, and those who remained behind. I adopt the stance of more recent historians writing with the benefit of greater temporal, geographical, and emotional distance from significant events. The latter portion of the second chapter addresses the second research question by delving into the more particular history of the post-war German community, reconstructing a timeline of significant events and shifts that influenced the community's ability to assert itself and to be culturally engaged and productive. The chapter concludes with brief commentary on the current state of the community.

Chapter three shifts the focus to the first research question, describing and documenting the German minority's attempts to produce literature and build a literary community under difficult conditions. The minority's sole national German-language newspaper occupies a central role in this narrative, as it represented the most consistent publishing outlet for the community over the forty-five years included in this study. The interactions between the readership and the editorial staff of the newspaper highlight the inherent challenges of asserting an unpopular minority's rights within a broadly oppressive Communist regime. At times, the newspaper encouraged literary aspirations; at others, it harshly rebuffed them.

This chapter also suggests a method for reading the literary texts included in the bibliography I compiled of the community's literary contributions. The texts do not belong to or constitute an identifiable "literature" such as one may find in other cultures, yet their

value as cultural artefacts is high given the lack of documentary evidence of this community. The end of this chapter includes biographical notes on all of the writers with works recorded in the literary bibliography; for the majority of these writers, these notes constitute the sole mention of their literary aspirations.

The final chapter shifts the focus from the community and their literary works, reflecting instead on the third research question and offering an analysis of how library practice and policy influence both the topics of research as well as the conduct of research. Libraries simultaneously enabled and thwarted the research project I undertook. Basing my conclusions on that experience, as well as my professional experience in libraries, I assert that what I encountered was not anomalous, but rather a typical experience for researchers studying marginal communities. Libraries have long taken pride in their role as custodians of the human record as well as in their ostensible neutrality when collecting, describing, and provisioning access to information. My project highlights what we are coming to understand as the limits of our neutrality, and this chapter concludes with some thoughts on how we might evolve as organizations to address these challenges.

Chapter 1: Research Questions, Scope, Literature Review, Methodology

Research Questions

This dissertation pursues a related set of research questions, two of which apply to the population under study, while the third explores facets of scholarly and library practice.

Research Question 1

The first research question, which stems directly from the topic at the core of the original research project conducted in 1998-1999, is to explore the extent to which it is possible to document attempts by the post-war German communities in Eastern Europe to maintain a German cultural sphere by tracing their literary publications. This question assumes, of course, that such literary publications exist at all, which as quickly became evident, they do. Early in the research, it emerged that in order to establish a workable scope, it would be necessary to scale down from the overly ambitious goal of tracking literary publications from all of the German-speaking communities from Eastern and Central Europe. Despite mass expulsions, there were still cohesive and active German communities in various parts of the Soviet Union as well as in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Hungary. Moreover, a review of the extant literature revealed that the communities in Russia, Romania, and Hungary had either already performed a fair amount of self-documentation and/or had received some scholarly attention. This discovery narrowed my focus on Czechoslovakia and Poland. While it was a somewhat arbitrary choice, I ultimately decided to pursue this research question with the post-war German community in Czechoslovakia as subject. In general, my knowledge of Czech and Slovak history exceeds what I know of Poland; the same applies to its contemporary institutions and culture. Additionally, after some preliminary investigation, it became evident to me that the situation in Poland was far more complex, largely stemming from various factors related to the Polish partition and to the more recent significant shift in Poland's borders after WWII.

Aside from its geographic scope, another aspect of this research question that invites explanation is the choice of documenting literature as a means of establishing the relative vitality of a culture. One could choose to focus on other manifestations of culture, but with specific regard to the German minority in Czechoslovakia, literature serves as a far more

effective indicator of cultural activity and vitality. For one, there is a long and well known tradition of literature in German emerging from these geographic regions, most significantly the nineteenth-century tradition represented by writers such as Adalbert Stifter and Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, as well as the twentieth-century Prague German tradition of Kafka, Werfel, Brod, and others. In addition to building upon that tradition, one could assert that for Germans who had just witnessed the expulsion of approximately 90% of their language community, writing and publishing literature was a political act, in some ways tantamount to a provocation. As Gerber points out, the long and continued existence of a German literature in the Bohemian lands had been an unintended yet manifest challenge to Czech patriotism (243). In a Czechoslovakia ostensibly cleansed of Germans, this challenge would clearly intensify. If under the severe conditions imposed by their status as a despised minority as well as by the generally culturally stultifying effects of Stalinism—which persisted longer in Czechoslovakia than in the Soviet Union—Germans speakers continued to write poetry and stories, it would indicate a strong desire not only to maintain but to express publicly their cultural identity as Germans.

Research Question 2

A related research question arises from the resolution of the first, namely, if it is possible to document cultural activity in the form of literature, what insights does the documentation of such activity provide us about the cultural politics within the German community post-1945 as well as about the real implications of Czechoslovak government policies toward minorities, in particular their German minority? Several factors contribute to a dearth of knowledge about this particular minority community. First, the sheer size of the expellee community and their political and social clout drew attention away from the fact that a fairly sizable minority remained post-expulsion. Compounding this was the fact that the expulsion targeted individuals with influential positions, e.g.- politicians, civil servants, teachers, and professors. In other words, the individuals who in a typically constituted community would be those most likely to record, document, and transmit culture were largely absent. This was exacerbated, of course, by the near total lack of any formal educational opportunities in the German language for the entire period from 1945-1990. Finally, severe restrictions on press and publication—on ideological, ethnic, and economic grounds—led to there being only one viable news publication, namely the newspaper

Aufbau und Frieden (AuF) and its successor *Die Prager Volkszeitung* (PVz). Its content was heavily dictated by government censors and practice.

Research Question 3

The third research question reflects upon the work undertaken to document this minority community and investigates the impact of policies and procedures in libraries and archives and how they influence scholarship. The case at hand—i.e., studying the history of an ostensibly expelled minority whose remaining members were at best overlooked and at worst despised and feared by the dominant culture—presents a particularly stark case study to examine how prevailing political and cultural biases can negatively impact library and archival practice. Put in more direct terms, various libraries and archives in the current Czech Republic have and/or had mandates to collect the materials and publications of various specified types from specific geographic areas, theoretically without regard for the language of publication. Yet it is clear from this research project that many of them failed to meet their mandate with regard to German-language materials. A naïve view in library and information science situates libraries and archives as repositories of the broad human record; a compounding assumption is that memory institutions pursue this duty neutrally. While these truisms may hold in narrow instances, practices and policies determine what institutions consider worthy of collecting and preserving; moreover, these practices and policies are informed both by management criteria such as resource scarcity as well as cultural conditions imposed by the society in which the institution exists. More recently, awareness that libraries and archives are inherently not neutral repositories has increased, perhaps the result of considerations forced on them by the digital age and its unmanageable profusion of textual sources, as well as by scholarly reconsideration of canons of all types. To name one example, a generation ago, scholarship related to children's or young adult literature was at best marginal in literary scholarship; correspondingly, most libraries declared it out of their collecting scope. Currently, scholarship in this area is booming, while libraries struggle to meet this scholarly community's textual needs. Similarly, in the discipline of history, the material available for historians to use as the basis for their analyses has been subjected to similarly restrictive collection policies that declare broad swaths of the "human" record out of scope. Inevitably, this in turns skews historiography toward being a history based on official records and accounts. As that discipline has come to

embrace cultural history, scholars have encountered challenges locating sources that support this type of work. The work I conducted falls within the realm of this latter category; I sought sources and information that have been haphazardly collected by libraries and archives, if collected at all. I seek to generalize the challenges I encountered to offer an informed criticism of several interlinked practices in libraries and archives. I also explore the impact of these practices on emergent forms of scholarship, such as the digital humanities.

Subject Population

As previously noted, it was necessary to narrow down the geographic scope to a specific German-speaking population in one country. For the reasons noted above, I chose to focus on the Germans that remained in Czechoslovakia after the active expulsions in 1945 and 1946. Given the fluidity and mobility of the era, I set aside more granular interrogations of ethnicity and instead define this community broadly and practically as individuals writing original works of literature in German (i.e., not translations from Czech or other languages), living within the borders of Czechoslovakia or working abroad as official representatives of the Czechoslovak government.

This definition requires some clarification. First, it does allow for the inclusion of individuals whose first language in daily usage might, in fact, have been Czech or Slovak. For one writer, Jaroslav Kuťák, this is demonstrably clear. While he did study Germanistik at the Humboldt University in Berlin and subsequently both work at the PVz and publish original works in German there, he later went on to write numerous published detective novels in Czech. Another clarification is that writers who chose subsequently to emigrate cease to appear in the bibliography at the point they leave Czechoslovakia, i.e., although having established themselves as in scope at one point in time, this status is not conferred ad infinitum.

The most definitive clarification is that the bibliography does not include any texts written by Germans expelled in 1945 or 1946 (commonly referred to collectively as Vertriebene). That may seem an obvious point given how the scope is formulated here, yet actual experience has demonstrated time and again that no matter how clearly one defines this topic, inevitably well-meaning and often well-informed interlocutors will begin offering advice and suggestions on how to connect with the expellee community, hence the need to state explicitly here that they are out of scope. This confusion is not without its

justifications. Quantitatively, literature by Vertriebene vastly overshadows anything written by those who remained behind. Moreover, given the size of the Vertriebene community and the resources generally available to it, there is a fairly mature body of scholarship dealing with nearly every aspect of its fate, including its literature. Berger's *Heimat, Loss, and Identity* (2015) is a typical example of this rich scholarship.

A significant source for the consistent interest in Vertriebene issues related to Czechoslovakia is sustained support and publicity from the Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft, the largest and most politically potent of the expellee organizations in the Federal Republic. Their existence and influence added another motivation to select a target population in Czechoslovakia. The shadow cast by the SL over the Verbliebene (i.e., those who remained behind; more on nomenclature in the subsequent section) has profound implications for their visibility, which I will discuss further in chapter two.

Definitions and Terminology

Given the complicated history of the region, as well as the need to acknowledge and address issues of bias, this topic requires gaining clarity around some frequently invoked concepts and entities.

Starting with the broadest category, it is necessary to define what one means when using the name Czechoslovakia. In the context of this work, it is used as an umbrella term to describe the country that came into existence in 1918 and continued to exist until January 1, 1993. This is done while acknowledging both that the country ceased to exist between 1939 and 1945 and that the borders changed prior to the Nazi occupation and yet again subsequent to the war. Within the 1945-1990 temporal scope of this work, however, the borders were stable, hence using Czechoslovakia requires little further clarification in this context. The official name of the country did, of course, change multiple times in this period, from Czechoslovak Republic to Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to Czech and Slovak Federative Republic, but other than in a few instances, these shifts have little bearing on the study at hand. In such instances, however, where it is necessary to refer to a specific regime, I will use the full name or abbreviation for the same; in other instances, Czechoslovakia obtains. Usage of the terms Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia refers, unless otherwise specified, to their usage within Czechoslovakia as the names of geographically defined

administrative regions, e.g., Northern Bohemia (Severní Čechy), not to nineteenth- and early twentieth-century usage related to questions of ethnic identity.

Many places names in Czechoslovakia—certainly all of them that have or had significant German presence—typically have Czech and German variants. In this work, place names will be recorded as Czech variant / German variant, e.g., Praha / Prag or Liberec / Reichenberg.

Scholars pursuing work that intersects with the actions taken by Czechs and Slovaks with regard to their German-speaking fellow citizens in 1945-1946 must come to terms with the competing terminologies applied to these events. Moreover, research that involves acts such as the expulsion of the German-speaking population from Czechoslovakia—which even generously viewed must be considered an act of ethnic cleansing—inevitably compels (and tempts) the researcher to address issues of guilt and right and wrong, if only for personal clarity and not with regard to the research itself. As such, it can be a struggle to use appropriately neutral language to refer to events that various parties see either as completely legitimate acts while others construe them as at least human rights violations if not outright crimes against humanity without allowing oneself to be guided by personal bias. There are multiple ways to refer to these acts in German, Czech, and English; it is necessary to position one's own work and writing within this existing linguistic puzzle. In most government documents, one typically sees the relatively harmless English word transfer or its respective German and Czech equivalents Aussiedlung (also Übersiedlung, Abschiebung) and odsun (also vyhoštění) used to describe, collectively and irrespective of methods, the relocation of over two million Germans from Czechoslovakia to Germany. Despite the shades of meaning that already begin to appear between Übersiedlung and Abschiebung, for example, translation of such fraught terms is at best an inexact science, and certainly the inadequacy of transfer as an English catch-all description for what was, in sober terms, the forced and often violent resettlement of millions of individuals, seems manifest. The same would apply to relocation, which brings to mind a planned, well executed process. It would seem that a more accurate and descriptive term would be expulsion with its connotations of force and urgency. It mirrors similar terms in German and Czech. In German, the Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft strictly uses Vertreibung and its various derivations (e.g., Vertriebene), significantly influencing general public discourse. In

Czech, vyhnání is still relatively taboo.[1] This dissertation will use—interchangeably and without intending variant emphasis—expulsion and Vertreibung to describe the events of 1945-1946 and expellee(s) and Vertriebene(n) to refer to those who were forced to leave Czechoslovakia in that same timeframe.

Describing the German population that remained after the expulsions is less explored territory, perhaps not surprising given its small size and broad geographic dispersal. Certain other remnant German communities in Central and Eastern Europe "benefited" from less historical baggage and were able to continue to use unambiguous names to refer to themselves that remained unaltered by the Nazi era and its toxic legacy, e.g., Ungarndeutsche, Wolgadeutsche, or the Siebenbürger Sachsen. During the Nazi era and extending back to the final decades of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, it was common to refer to the German population in Czechoslovakia and in Bohemia and Moravia as the Sudetendeutsche, including those who did not live within the actual geographic boundaries of the regions considered Sudeten. An exception to this practice, even prior to the war, was that German speakers living in Prague typically rejected Sudetendeutsche as a classification for themselves, preferring instead Prager Deutsche. Given the events of the Nazi era, in particular the nationalist movement around Henlein, by 1945 sudetendeutsch was an absolutely taboo descriptor within Czechoslovakia. Given that sentiment, as well as the legacy of inconsistent application, sudetendeutsch cannot be considered as a shorthand for those individuals not expelled. The lack of a specific identifier often leads to is the use of literal, yet patently unwieldy, descriptions for the community: e.g., German-speakers remaining in Czechoslovakia after the expulsions of 1945-1946. Such formulations become tiresome with repeated usage, but simply referring to them as Germans fails to define them narrowly enough and is thus not only inadequate, but also somewhat inappropriate. The inappropriateness stems from the complex interplay that existed in the Czech lands for centuries between three main resident ethnicities, Germans, Jews, and Czechs, where various markers were used at various times and for various purposes to claim ethnicities and statuses. A person could identify as German in one census, for example, and then largely legitimately identify as Czech in a subsequent census on the basis of marriage,

[1] Underscoring this, the Czech version of Wikipedia has a fairly fulsome page outlining the concept of vyhoštění (Abschiebung), while vyhnání lacks a dedicated page.

political convenience, personal advantage, etc.; such individuals were known as amphibians (Glassheim 2016, 99), a term coined by Nazi anthropologists (Bryant 2002, 684). Bryant's research into national identity between 1939-1946 underscores how individuals could choose to switch nationality, but also that nationality could be imposed by external actors (Ibid.). Franz Kafka is a notable example of this tangled web of identity: Czech origins, world famous for his German prose, Jewish, and fluent in both dominant languages. Is he German, Czech, or Jewish? All three communities claim him as theirs to various ends. Much scholarly ink has been spilt on such questions, too much to recapitulate in detail here. It suffices to note that the use of "Germans" in the context of the research presented here occurs with full recognition of its fluid application to individuals and groups without exploring it further.

Suggestions have been made for monikers for this group, some half-heartedly in jest, others more earnest. In the former category, a 1990 editorial in PVz referred to them as the Rest-Deutsche, or rump Germans.[2] While vividly descriptive, as the community consists of those who remained behind, it carries a slight pejorative taint, and therefore is rejected for usage here. More commonly, those writing about the topic who are affiliated with the Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft tend to refer to them as the Heimatverbliebene or similar formulations such as "in der Heimat Verbliebenen." This formulation, however elegantly juxtaposed with (Heimat)Vertriebene, either blithely ignores or provocatively invokes the myriad negative post-war connotations associated with the concept Heimat given the Nazis' crass instrumentalization of the term. Hence in this work I use the term Verbliebene to describe the group of individuals who remained within the borders of Czechoslovakia and continued to define themselves as German after the expulsions.

In the context of terminology, it also bears noting that this work adheres to its original purpose of documenting the literary production of the Verbliebene and the related questions articulated above. Working with this population requires extensive engagement with the extant scholarly literature on the general subject of Czech-German relations in the twentieth-century, much of which inevitably displays traces of influence from prevailing views or of specific points articulated by various dominant voices, such as the Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft. Even some of the numbers one may use in such a context can be passionately contested. How many Germans were killed in the 1945

[2] *Prager Volkszeitung*. 8 June 1990. 3

massacre in Ústí nad Labem / Aussig, 300 or 3,000? How many Germans died as a consequence of the expulsions, 27,000 or 300,000? In even ostensibly scholarly accounts, such wide variances are commonplace, even with regard to more serious issues of individual guilt and accountability; for some scholars, Beneš is essentially a war criminal, the architect of the expulsions, for others merely the overseer of the inevitable. There are three specific issues, which while critical for framing and situating the study, on which I am taking no position or making any attempt to resolve; I see one purpose of my study as enabling scholars in other disciplines where the pursuit of such issues is the purpose of their work to approach the issue with more access to the issues from the Verbliebene viewpoint. The first of these is the complex interplay between Czech, Jewish, and German ethnicity. The second concerns establishing guilt and the complicity of various groups and individuals in events related to the decimation of the German community in Czechoslovakia. Last, while acknowledging the variances in some of the numerical data related to these events—e.g., number of deaths, size of remaining community—my research and its attendant data do not enable taking a position as to the veracity of any such claims.

Scholarship on the Verbliebene

An invisible community

The Verbliebene in Czechoslovakia have largely escaped notice by scholars. The extent of this gap in the record is illustrated well by commentary on a talk I gave on my research at the academic conference "Nationalist Myths and Pluralist Realities in Central Europe" at the University of Alberta in 2002. The Canadian Centre for Austrian and Central European Studies at the University of Alberta and the Center for Austrian Studies at the University of Minnesota co-organized the event, which was attended primarily by a tightly networked group of historians who specialize in the region. Given their expertise and background, I had anticipated finding an audience more knowledgeable about the Verbliebene in general than I was at the time, yet that was not the case, as in the meantime I have experienced repeatedly. In numerous conversations, it became clear that only one or two scholars in attendance had any clear picture of the existence and fate of a German community in Czechoslovakia post-1946. A casual remark about my talk in a summary of the conference published by two attendees captures well the void into which my research falls. They noted that while the session in which I spoke was entitled “Czech myths” that I “began by

discussing Germans in Czechoslovakia," overlooking both the convenient Czech myth that underlies my research, i.e., that the expulsion was complete, as well as the multi-ethnic reality that still exists in Czechoslovakia and has a centuries-long legacy (Zayarnyuk and Pavlovic 2001). Underscoring the lack of scholarly attention, Ingrid Pavel, longtime journalist and editor with the PVz, repeatedly commented to me that I was the only scholar who had, in her experience, ever approached the newspaper in the course of research or included it in their research. Certainly, with the lone exception of Lenka Reinerová, none of the community members whom I have interviewed or contacted for this project had ever been contacted by other researchers.

Pavel's latter assertion—that the newspaper has not been used in research—does not quite hold up. The sole German-language newspaper of the era, *Die Prager Volkszeitung*, and its predecessor *Aufbau und Frieden* were, in fact, known to scholars, but the resulting scholarship is sparse. Reinhard Roche conducted an extensive linguistic study of language usage in the PVz on the basis of several years of publication in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In the published protocol of the question and answer period after he presented this research at a conference on divergent language usage in the FRG and GDR—the inclusion of this off-topic subject in such a conference is itself indicative of its marginal existence, much as my talk in Alberta was slightly outside the scope—Roche addressed the challenges of getting access to such small newspapers from the Soviet bloc in the West, noting that "ich war ja schon froh, daß ich hier im Westen überhaupt das "Neue Deutschland" bekam, die "Märkische Volksstimme" etwa wird man nicht so leicht bekommen" (1973, 335). When asked specifically if he intended to extend his research to earlier years of the paper in order to study the influence of assimilation pressures, he replied, "[i]n der ČSSR gibt es kaum noch Zeitungen von damals. Auch in den Archiven ist man nicht mehr so freigiebig mit älteren Zeitungen. Aber demnächst erwarte ich welche, die 1951 erschienen sind" (Ibid., 337). In the intervening decades, the situation has not much improved. Work such as Roche's provides, however, some essential material for subsequent researchers, as he surrounded his linguistic analysis with extensive contextual information about the newspaper, its conditions of creation, and the community it purported to serve.

Another rare instance of a scholar using either AuF or the PVz as a major source were two articles published in *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* in the early 1980s. Apparently intended to be a running feature, they appeared

under the title "Berichte zum kulturellen Leben in der ČSSR im Jahre …" but for reasons not explained only two installments appeared for 1980 and the first half of 1981 (Härtel 1981). The articles offered an annotated summary of cultural activity as reported in Czechoslovak newspapers, including the PVz. As with Roche's work, Härtel also offered brief yet useful contextual information about the PVz and its community. Other scholars publishing in *Bohemia* also occasionally utilized AuF and PVz as source material, albeit not as intensively as Härtel, which at least signals that it was fairly well known as a potential source within this narrow disciplinary community (Hilf 1971, Brügel 1985, Eisch 1999). Writers such as Hilf and Brügel represent a group of post-war scholars in the FRG who published their work in journals such as *Bohemia*, *Osteuropa*, *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung*, and other narrowly focused journals. Much of their work, as Eisch pointedly notes, treated questions relevant to the *Vertriebene* community, typically commenting on the Verbliebene only as a vehicle for formulating anti-Czech criticisms (1999, 280). Despite this bias, some of their work does relate useful and largely accurate insights, although one must navigate deftly around tired clichés and tropes and question their numbers (of victims, expellees, etc.). Most importantly, as Eisch further asserts, this scholarship does not grant agency to the Verbliebene, in other words, the scholars are writing about them without actually engaging with the community. One hallmark of this community is that they were never permitted access to public discourses about themselves in Germany or Czechoslovakia and its successor republics (Ibid.).

Even scholars who were aware of it as a source may not have delved very deeply into it for material, as shown by their confusion over the name of the newspaper at its founding. Eisch, in a footnote explaining the interconnection between the Kulturverband and the newspaper, refers to it as *Arbeit und Friede* (Eisch 1999, 295). Similarly, in an otherwise meticulously researched history on the connection of Fürnberg and Weiskopf to the Slánský show trials, the author refers to AuF as *Einheit und Frieden* (Gerber 2016, 228). Pointing this out is not an exercise in editorial fastidiousness, but rather intended to highlight that obviously neither author had engaged deeply in using it as a source; otherwise they would surely not commit such an elementary error in documentation. In point of fact, their own footnotes and works cited lists indicate that neither actually uses it as a textual source; they mention it only as contextual information. While this practice could be excused using Roche's argument about the difficulty of accessing it, by the late 1990s, a largely intact run

of AuF was readily available in at least two major German libraries. That it lacks an index or any other finding aid, however, means that using it as a source requires extensive labour, a point to which I return in chapter four.

A 2002 dissertation that delves into the complexities of relations between Czechoslovakia and the FRG between 1984 and 1997 on the basis of Czech and German newspaper accounts does at least use the PVz as an extensive source, also citing its name correctly (Witte, 2002). That said, the work is dominated by discussions of expellee political activities, most notably those of the Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft, as one would expect given their influence and the copious extant source material. Moreover, the author reads the PVz as the official voice of the KV, which to some extent is correct, but ignores the origins of the paper, its central communicative role for the German community, and, not least, the harshly restrictive politics of publishing any newspaper in Czechoslovakia after 1968. In general, the author tends to take statements in the PVz as de facto expressions from the German community, which discounts the highly politicized nature of the KV and its chronic—perhaps preprogrammed—inability to achieve significant gains for the Verbliebene community, something of which the domestic German community was well aware. Despite these issues, it marks a rare occasion where a scholar attempts to give voice to the Verbliebene. It bears mention that this dissertation is practically unavailable in North America given that it was issued by a publisher flagged as inconsequential by the major supplier of German scholarly materials to North America.

Scholarship on the expulsions

One of the major flaws in scholarship related to the expulsions that my research seeks to counteract is an assumption that the expulsions of 1945 and 1946 were complete, when in fact perhaps up to 10% of the community remained in Czechoslovakia per most estimates. A diverse group of historians specializing in this region expresses this assumption either explicitly or implicitly in their work. One historian states categorically in the introduction to his monograph on Czech-German relations in České Budějovice / Budweis that “the restored Czechoslovakia eliminated German politics from the Bohemian lands by expelling its entire German population ...” and reinforces that assertion only a few pages later mentioning “the expulsion of all Germans” (King 2002, xiii and 6). Another noted scholar acknowledges that the expulsion was not complete, but that the remaining Germans

trickled out a few thousand per year in the 1940s and 1950s, an only partially accurate claim (Smelser 1996, 89). More recently, historians have begun to moderate their assertions on this point. Glassheim's recently published monograph does eventually note that a German population did remain, but fairly far into the work and then only in passing (2016, 96). In the introduction, he frames it tacitly as a complete expulsion and resettlement, such that a typical reader would assume that all Germans were expelled (Ibid., 6-7). Others are more explicit about the remaining community, such as Tampke, who provides a figure of 230,000 Germans at the end of the 1940s, albeit again only in passing fairly far into the text (Tampke 2003, 81). In sum, it perhaps suffices to describe the scholarship largely as focussing on macropolitical issues related to expulsion such as the Beneš decrees or the Potsdam Conference and/or to the post-war fate of the Sudeten region during the waves of resettlement by Czechs and other nationalities with Czech government support and encouragement (e.g., Wiedemann 2007). Additionally, much of the scholarship displays the tendency to examine what happened in 1945 and 1946 in light of the long history of Czech-German antagonism that intensified dramatically in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Given these emphases, the presence of a small and disorganized post-1946 German community is understandably immaterial to broader questions of Cold War politics, German guilt, deep-rooted ethnic conflict, and Czech national aspirations. Put somewhat differently, they are perhaps simply an inconvenience to be ignored.

This latter view certainly dominates the public discourse. It is also critical to observe the two entities that dominate public discourse around the expulsions and the decrees that encouraged rogue expulsions and then sanctioned and legitimized organized transfers. On the German side, the influence of the Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft cannot be overstated. As the largest and most vocal of the various Landsmannschaften representing expellees from the East, it has exercised strong influence over German discourse around expulsion for decades. Its primary purpose as an organization is to represent the interests of the expelled, one of which has always been to reject the notion of collective guilt used to justify or rationalize the expulsions. It would not serve this end to acknowledge unequivocally that perhaps as much as 10% of their community was not expelled. Whatever the actual reasons, the obvious and superficial interpretation would inevitably revolve around degrees of guilt, with the implication being that those expelled were guilty of something and that those who remained were blameless for Nazi excesses and atrocities.

The reality is, of course, far more complex than such convenient binary distinctions. Nonetheless, their official documents and statements generally omit mention of the community that remained behind. A sketch history posted on their contemporary Website typifies this omission. In a timeline diagram, it merely notes that the "Vertreibung der rund drei Millionen Sudetendeutschen ist 1947 weitgehend abgeschlossen" (Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft 2017). In the context of SL rhetoric and policies, 'weitgehend' here would generally connote that the expulsions were finished later, not that a portion of the community was deliberately permitted to remain.

On the perpetrator side of the expulsions, while the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia did not solely set the expulsions in motion, they inherited this legacy when they assumed power in 1948, subsequently dominating for decades the official status and welfare of the German minority. During the early years of the Comintern, the Soviet Union exerted direct pressure on multiple Czechoslovak Communist parties (largely ethnically defined) to merge into one party, which was consummated in 1921 with the founding of the Komunistická strana Československa (KSČ). Given the central presence of German leadership in the unified party's early days, including Karl Kreibich, who later frequently published pieces in AuF, the KSČ remained remarkably internationalist in its stance toward the German presence in Czechoslovakia throughout the 1930s. By the end of the war, however, this position had reversed itself and the Communists offered no meaningful opposition to expulsion. The following chapter will more closely chart the relationship between the KSČ and the German minority. It suffices here to note that this hardline stance stifled any public discussion of the expulsions, including scholarship. The primary concern of the party in the aftermath of the expulsions was to resettle what they considered vacant land and to reinvigorate industry in previously German-dominated regions (Wiedemann 2007, Glassheim 2016).

The net effect of the influence exerted by the SL and the KSČ on the public imagination is easily identified. Wikipedia pages for cities in the Czech Republic that once had sizable German majorities dispense with the Germans most often with an offhand reference to expulsion. In Opava / Troppau, the "entire German population of Opava was forcibly expelled" ("Opava" n.d.), while in Šumperk / Mährisch Schönberg, "German inhabitants were expelled" ("Šumperk" n.d.). One can locate the origins of such modern examples of language that excludes the possibility that the expulsion was incomplete in works such as *Dokumente zur Austreibung der Sudetendeutschen*, originally published in 1951 by the

Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Wahrung sudetendeutscher Interessen. It sets a tone dominated by tales of horrific violence perpetrated by Czechs against Germans, offering hundreds of pages of eyewitness accounts without the benefit of any contextualizing narrative nor any biographical details for the eyewitnesses or victims, such as NSDAP membership or role during the occupation. In such a work, there is no room—more to the point, there is nothing to be gained—to mention that while some Germans were being humiliated, robbed, raped, and even brutally murdered by the Czech Revolutionary Guard and other partisans, others were left in their homes and villages. While in subsequent decades, there are infrequent reports of Germans living in Czechoslovakia in the German press, such as a 1968 article in *Der Spiegel*, these remain widely isolated exceptions ("Wieder Goethe" 1968).

Post-revolution scholarship

The end of the Communist regime brought with it a fundamental shift in the prevailing rhetoric. For one, Czech historians, notably Tomáš Staněk, were now able to publish their work exploring the detailed history of the expulsion and acknowledging Czech participation in atrocities. Glassheim notes that Staněk's *Odsun Němců z Československa 1945-1947* (1991) is "the most important contribution to this new historiography" that seeks not to "justify the expulsions," but rather to "document them and to understand more clearly the longer-term consequences of the massive depopulation" (2001, 211). In 1990, the governments of Germany and the Czech Republic convened a joint committee of historians (Deutsch-Tschechoslowakische Historiker-Kommission, after 1993 the Deutsch-Tschechische und Deutsch-Slowakische Historikerkommission) to study the historical relationship between the two (then three) nations. Among the topics they have addressed are the expulsion and its aftermath; their work has sought to dispel myths and arrive at more accurate numerical estimates of, for example, the number of Germans killed during the expulsions.

Even prior to this 1990 turn, there were some exceptions to the general pattern of scholarly neglect of the Vertriebene, some of which I discussed earlier, e.g., Roche's linguistic analysis. Rudolf Hilf's article "Die Deutschen in der Tschechoslowakei" in *Bohemia* (1971) addresses general issues related to the post-1946 community. Thus again we see that within the relatively small sphere of contributors and readers of this journal this was at least a topic of which some were generally aware. Such treatments are rare and generally

found only in European journals and books. In recent years, there are modest signs of renewed scholarly interest in this community, as indicated by a bachelor's thesis written at the Charles University in Prague on the activities of German cultural organizations in Liberec / Reichenberg and Vratislavice / Maffersdorf (Petrnoušková 2012). While this development is encouraging to see, the temporal scope of this 2012 study, 1989-1999, may well indicate the challenge of studying similar topics for the years prior to 1989, namely, a lack of credible documentation locatable in managed archives. The conflicts between competing German organizations post-revolution have been relatively well documented in the PVz and other German-language newspapers published in the Czech Republic after 1990, such as the *LandesZeitung*. Nevertheless, a Czech bachelor's thesis is perhaps a positive bellwether of a turn in scholarship. The continued work of the Historikerkommission will also likely continue to foster scholarly interest.

In more recent historiography, one can discern a shift in focus away from framing discussions of the expulsion around macropolitical actions and events toward a cultural history approach that examines much more closely the origins and outcomes of such events, not just the events themselves. In the 1990s the Kommission issued a dense series of titles exploring numerous facets of Czech, German, and Slovak relations throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, most co-edited by noted German and Czech historians. This series emerges from and further fosters a turn away from the "Beneš-bashing" that marks much earlier scholarship, in particular that written by scholars with personal connections to the expulsion (Luža 1964). While the years since 1990 have marked an intense proliferation of scholarship taking new approaches to Czech-German relations, my aim here is not to recapitulate that work but to acknowledge its utility for framing my study. At the same time I mean to point out—as I discovered at the 2001 conference—that this newer scholarship does not often address the specific history of the Verbliebene other than in brief acknowledgements that such a community existed.

Language and scholarship

From the previous discussion, it is clear that one cannot avoid the issue of language when discussing the state of Verbliebene scholarship. While it is true that Czech scholars such as Staněk can now research and publish free of constraint, such works often appear only in the Czech language. While many historians of Central Europe will be able to read

German scholarship, fewer will be capable of reading Czech, a comparatively obscure language taught extensively at only a handful of North American (and German) universities. While clearly some German and North American scholars producing major works in recent years—e.g., Glassheim, King, Gerber, et al.—are capable of reading Czech archival material (and/or have the means to have it translated), this subset of historians is very small.

My own work reflects the height of this language barrier. It was clearly necessary to acknowledge and consult Staněk's scholarship, not least to access some of its well researched statistical data on the Verbliebene. His 1993 *Německá menšina v českých zemích: 1948-1989* (The German Minority in the Czech Lands: 1948-1989) remains the only monographic treatment of this community. As it has not been translated into English or German—yet widely recognized as a seminal work, both for its scholarship and for breaking various taboos in the Czech scholarly community—it was necessary to scan pages and then run them through optical character recognition using Adobe Acrobat's native OCR engine. Czech's heavy usage of diacritics creates challenges for OCR, so I had to hand correct the OCR using my limited but serviceable Czech abilities. After further cleaning up the language and text formatting using Microsoft Word, I could plug them into Google Translate and get a somewhat readable translation. The point here is that it took several hours of tedious work just to get one small portion of one Czech monograph into marginally usable form.

One revelation from this work was Staněk's consistent use of the first-person plural: we, us, ours. This usage indicates that his intent in writing these books was first and foremost to educate the Czech reading public (and perhaps his own Czech academic peers), an understandable desire after over forty years of Communist constraints on scholarship. This usage also contrasts starkly with the body of scholarship I read on this topic from German and North American historians. They steadfastly refrain from using the first-person plural, other than when referring to historians as a group. Even German scholars who were themselves Vertriebene refer to the expellees in the third person, for example. This century has seen one of Staněk's monographs translated into German; similarly, a work by Václav Houžvička, *Czechs and Germans 1848-2004: The Sudeten Question and the Transformation of Central Europe* appeared in 2016 in English. It is, however, generally disappointing that after over a generation, so little Czech scholarship has been made accessible to a wider scholarly community.

Scholarship on significant personalities

In contrast to the general scholarly neglect of the Verbliebene population and its publications, specific individuals in the community have received sporadically intensive scholarly attention, namely a small circle of tightly connected authors and politicians, all, not coincidentally, members of the Communist Party. Most of the writers in this grouping had, with one exception, established themselves as published authors or journalists before 1938: Egon Erwin Kisch, F.C. Weiskopf, Louis Fürnberg, and Theodor Balk. The scholarly literature on Kisch, Weiskopf, and Fürnberg is both extensive and not directly relevant to the research presented here; therefore I do not address it in detail. One should recognize nevertheless that scholarly interest in all three was to some extent a bridge connecting Germanists in the Czech Republic with the broader Germanist community. The resulting exchanges offer occasional glimpses into the broader Verbliebene community. Scholars such as their Czechoslovak contemporaries and fellow germanophones Paul Reimann and Eduard Goldstücker deliberately included discussion of works by Kisch, Fürnberg, and Weiskopf in treatments of broader German literary topics while explicitly establishing their national origins as relevant to their work (Reimann 1961, Goldstücker 1963). Balk is far less well known internationally, but has nevertheless been the subject of scholarly studies (Schock 1984, Patka 1999). The one exception, Lenka Reinerová, is not much of an exception, given that she was closely acquainted with Kisch, Fürnberg, and Weiskopf, and married to Balk. Although she began writing at a young age and published her first book in the 1950s, recognition was slow to arrive, partly due to her status as a persona non grata in Czechoslovakia after 1968 and a resulting domestic publication ban that lasted decades. Ultimately, both the popular press and scholars "discovered" her around the turn of the twenty-first century, frequently hailing her as the last living representative of the Prague German circle, a kind but perhaps somewhat overly generous assertion given that she was twenty-two and as yet unpublished in 1938. In the last years of her adventurous life, she appeared in numerous newspaper articles and received some critical attention from scholars (Honegger 2005, Grub 2010).

In sum the literature concerned with these five writers is copious, yet it generally avoids discussing the broader topic of the expulsion and its aftermath, other than the specific impact events had on the individual, such as Gerber's aforementioned work on the Slánský

trials and their impact on Fürnberg and Weiskopf (2016). Gerber documents well what others tend only to gesture obliquely toward, namely that these two passionate Czechoslovak citizens did not simply choose to emigrate to the GDR to engage more directly with a German readership, but rather out of the very real fear of persecution, perhaps even prosecution and execution, in Czechoslovakia. Similarly, in the case of others in the German-speaking community who achieved notoriety, the literature related to them focuses on their role and downplays aspects related to ethnicity or minority status. Two such individuals are Bruno Köhler and Karl Kreibich, both products of German-speaking homes who had long careers as functionaries in the Czechoslovak Communist Party. Kreibich, who co-founded the party, largely assimilated after the war, choosing mainly to speak and write Czech for national matters, while publishing articles in German for the newspaper. His posthumously published memoir appeared in Czech, while a proposed parallel publication in German was summarily rejected by the publisher of the Czech edition (Kreibich 1968), an event I discuss further in chapter three. Köhler, despite his unmistakably German name, also cultivated his public persona in the Czech language. One of his most significant speeches, where he declared categorically that Czechoslovakia had no German minority, was delivered and published in Czech (Köhler 1960). Brügel suggests that Köhler survived party purges and endured by virtue of being considered an "Ehrenslawe," avoiding German when speaking publicly and avoiding association with AuF (1957, 555). Whether authors or politicians, these individuals are typically not connected by scholars to the concerns of the broader German-speaking community. The glaringly obvious question—how and by what means an ethnic German could become so prominent in a nation that violently expelled its German population—generally goes unasked and unanswered.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the shift in scholarship initiated by the fall of the Communist regime and the founding of the joint historical commission has slowly reverberated through Czech public discourse. This has been further supported by interest shown by the government in acknowledging their German minority—the same one declared non-existent by Köhler in 1960—and correcting numerous perceptions about the Czech-German past. While in general, Czechoslovak and Czech governments after 1990 continued the subsidies that allowed various minorities—including Germans—to publish newspapers and periodicals as well as to organize cultural events, this was done with little fanfare other than reporting the amounts disbursed. Starting in 2001, the Council for National Minorities of the

Government of the Czech Republic began issuing detailed annual reports covering a wide range of minorities and activities (2001, 2002, 2003). One could speculate that this intense engagement with minority issues may have been part of the government's application for membership in the European Union, which was successful with the Czech Republic joining the EU on May 1, 2004. The reports continue to appear annually, however, and are remarkable both for their level of detail as well as their inclusion of "self-study" sections from the various minorities, as articulated by their representatives on the Council. The German community's contributions to this section of the report are often pointed and show a willingness to raise issues that would have been entirely taboo to raise in earlier times. Similarly, Radio Prague's limited German-language programming addressed similar issues and broke other taboos, in particular with its series *Minderheiten in der Tschechischen Republik* (Sliva, Schultheis 2003). While ultimately the reports and their public echoes are well outside the 1945-1990 timeframe for the research at hand, I mention them here to signal how scholarship has slowly shifted public discourse from ignorance or outright denial toward recognition and open discussion. Unfortunately, it is likely too late to be of much practical significance for the remaining German community, which as the reports note consists overwhelmingly of elderly individuals or newcomers arriving for work and business reasons.

Bibliographic Methodology

Types of bibliographies

Most of the standard manuals and guides for bibliography published in the twentieth century concern themselves with rigid and narrow definitions and rules. Different scholars assign names to various types of bibliographic work, often slightly at odds to assertions by still others. Perhaps anticipating such a state of affairs, Schneider wrote in 1926 of bibliography that it was a "mushrooming" field, with new aspects and applications entering constantly (Schneider, transl. by Shaw 1961, 15). Willoughby's concept of bibliography divides it into two categories: enumerative and critical, analytical, or material (1957, 13). Bowers, in turn, distinguishes between textual and analytical bibliography, the former being primarily concerned with "internal form, or contents" while the latter is based on physical examination of a specimen in an attempt to draw conclusions based on its manufacture (1964, 27). Robinson, explicitly following Esdaile's lead, identifies three kinds of

bibliography: analytical, historical, and systematic (1971, 9). Similarly, Harmon divides the practice into analytical or critical bibliography and enumerative or systematic bibliography (1998, 4). Helpfully, Willoughby notes in his work that it is unfortunate that there is only one term—bibliography—for two different kinds of works; this lack of specific nomenclature does sow great confusion and lead to lengthy disquisitions on the finer distinctions (1957, 17).

According to these standard definitions, the bibliography I have compiled classifies as an enumerative, textual, and/or systematic bibliography. Yet according to some of these mid-century scholars, what I have done is not strictly bibliography. They generally conscribe this term to the act of describing texts in systematic form to books alone, i.e., texts published in codex form. Their bias for the book reflects the era that inspired the art, but most of these writers acknowledge that other textual types, even non-textual media, may have their place in bibliographies. Cultures beyond the Anglo-American can have slightly different traditions; for example, Balsamo, writing from an Italian perspective, suggests that bibliography means working only with books, while other media types fall under the rubric of documentation (1990, 180). While there was once a professional designation of documentalist (akin to the German Dokumentar)—mid-twentieth-century scholars of bibliography tend to refer to documentalist as a profession parallel to bibliographer—it has disappeared from usage as the tasks to which it once applied have undergone radical change, e.g., researchers now search databases directly—unmediated—rather than using mediated search services staffed by documentalists and other information professionals. In general, although only two or three generations have passed since the publication of most of the seminal works that attempt to define and situate bibliography as a practice or science, the arguments raised seem outdated and irrelevant in an age when so much information is created and transmitted digitally and the concept of "text" has become so relativized as to include nearly any media that can be "read," even films and art works.

If we accept, then, that bibliographies can and do contain multiple textual forms, there remains the question as to the purpose of bibliographies, which is in turn closely related to the question of whether their preparation is an art, practice, or science. Bibliographies that require close physical inspection of specific objects in order to address narrow points related to origin and edition—e.g., the intense effort applied to myriad editions of Shakespearean plays—dominated the discourse around bibliography as a practice in the

early decades of the twentieth century, yet over the course of that period, the more general purpose of bibliographies as a tool for connecting readers and scholars to information that otherwise might elude them came to the fore. The bibliography introduced here fulfills such a purpose, creating pathways to information not otherwise identifiable through libraries' array of bibliographic sources, e.g., union catalogues, indices, and A&I (abstracting and indexing) databases. Chapter four delves more deeply into the role libraries could play in facilitating this type of access. Regarding the issue of whether it is an art or a science, Schneider makes short work of this matter when he notes that "Bibliography is an auxiliary science to all sciences" (1961, 20). Willoughby similarly notes that it is an "ancillary science," that "serves its true function when it is an efficient tool to solve problems in history, literature or some like subject" (1957, 17).

Classifying this bibliography

Theorists of bibliography writing in the latter half of the previous century tended to conclude their works with a nod toward the coming digital era, often tentatively expressing the hope that computers would solve the issues of scale that human bibliographers could not manage. Alas, computers have become so dominant in the field of capturing textual information, even if they do not solve all of the issues, that there are no longer any theorists of bibliography that conceive of it as a human activity. A few bibliographies still appear annually in print, yet there is no longer much discussion about what constitutes a good bibliography. Our attention has gone elsewhere.

As Harmon notes in his relatively recently published treatise, bibliography is a confusing term and modern technology has made that confusion much worse (1998, 1). In the twenty-first century, we seem to have solved the debate by wholly embracing the digital turn and relegating bibliography to a reduced role as a scholarly aid for discovery. Indeed, the advent of technology has abetted the expansion of the term "bibliography" to include lists of texts that are entirely heterogeneous in nature, not simply books. In this century, no one would likely dispute that the works I have compiled constitute a bibliography, but there is a large vacuum in terms of methodological guidance for creating and managing such works. The fact that most bibliographies will never be published in book form only further exacerbates this void, as the earlier need to delineate form for publication necessitated having rules and a set of agreed-upon practices. What this means, to some degree, is that bibliography is in a

nebulous and ill-defined condition these days. This state of affairs is not all that surprising when we consider how much of the work of connecting readers and researchers with texts has been automated and turned over to machines, with both positive and negative outcomes, as I discuss further in the final chapter.

Despite the lack of contemporary guidance and the various disagreements among bibliographic theorists of the previous century as to the types of bibliography, it is possible to assign the bibliography at hand to a category. Doing so enables a potential user to know what to expect and how to use it; it also makes a small contribution to perpetuating libraries and librarians as creators of pathways to information by means of applying structured, human-generated analysis. Harmon's rubrics, analytical/critical and enumerative/systematic, as two main bibliographic categories point to a viable solution. While in some aspects, the bibliography presented here would be in its most basic form considered a type of systematic or enumerative bibliography—it most superficially resembles a newspaper index, given that most of its entries stem from newspaper sources—Harmon's definitions would seem to place it in a subcategory of analytical bibliography. He notes that this type further subdivides into textual, historical/material, and descriptive; historical or material bibliographies can document, among other functions, "the evidence books provide about culture and society in specific eras of time" (1998, 4). Later, he repeats this assertion, adding, "it becomes archaeological in nature" (1998, 88). This archaeological notion reflects the intent of my first research question, namely, to ask to what extent it is possible, based on historical evidence, to document, and in some ways to reconstruct, the cultural activities of a group that otherwise eluded systematic documentation. It also opens the door to considerations of the ethnographic nature of bibliography when applied in this fashion.

Other writers, such as Robinson, would apply a more general category to the bibliography, namely systematic bibliography, which would contradict Harmon's point about providing evidence about culture and society pushing a bibliography more toward the analytical/critical side (Robinson 1971, 9). To reiterate, there is little agreement between bibliographic theorists on how to classify bibliographies; this lack of consensus is perhaps indicative of the wide range of conditions and needs that lead to their compilation as well as of the sheer diversity of the textual types they contain. All of the writers, however, do tend to agree that bibliography is not a mechanical act, akin to data entry or certain forms of

indexing, but rather an intellectual and scholarly pursuit. Useful bibliographies, to this way of thinking, require a degree of familiarity with the context of the works that one would characterize as a scholarly approach. Robinson notes that, regardless of how one classifies a bibliography per the generally accepted critical versus descriptive dichotomy, "both require a background of scholarship if the work is to be authoritative" (1971, 12). McKerrow makes the point that beyond the material manifestation of a work, judgment is necessary in order to place it in context and to understand its significance. He allows that these "newer kinds of bibliographical investigation" belong more to textual criticism than to formal bibliography (1967, 3).

Methods and techniques used for this bibliography

This section lays out the specific practices followed to compile this bibliography. Some of them reflect standard practice while others reflect a need to set arbitrary boundaries in order to maintain a manageable scope as well as to create a cohesive, useful product. They are presented here in order to document the process.

In hindsight, it is not surprising that many of the standard works used to identify publications by a set of authors within a given time frame proved nearly useless for this project. As I discuss in greater detail in chapter three, the Verbliebene had poor access to book publishers. Other than in the case of a few individuals, this lack of access was categorically the case, for cultural, political, and economic reasons. I initiated my search for publications by consulting the Czechoslovak national bibliography (Česká kniha—after 1955 České knihy). While it did include some titles published in German, these were generally canonical literary texts, not books by contemporary writers. The national bibliography did alert me to Staněk's scholarly works mentioned earlier in this chapter; through his books' bibliographies, I discovered the German-language Verbliebene newspaper AuF and its successor PVz.

After I identified the newspapers as a potential major source, my next step was to locate a complete run of the newspaper. For many twentieth-century newspapers, this is not a major challenge. At a minimum, a local or regional library will maintain a full run, at least on microfilm if not in digital form; in some instances, national libraries consider these titles to be within their collection scope. AuF and PVz were federally subsidized national newspapers published in Prague. Given this fact, the Czech National Library should, per its

general historical collection remit, have a full run of the newspapers; one would also expect the same to be the case at major regional libraries in Ústí nad Labem / Aussig or Liberec / Reichenberg. The National Library has no issues from the period of my study (only 1992-); similarly, the North Bohemian Research Library in Ústí only holds the paper from 1992 forward. The Regional Research Library in Liberec has a nearly complete run, but in the late 1990s when I compiled the main portion of the bibliography I was unable to consult an online catalogue to ascertain this and a language barrier made (and makes) it challenging to interact with this library online. In Germany, where I was based during this work, the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin has the most complete run, while the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek and the research library of the Collegium Carolinum in Munich also have extensive runs; all three runs are bound paper with no portion on microfilm or in digital form. Common to all of these holdings, however, are gaps of greater and lesser extent. For example, in 1968, the Prague Spring and subsequent Warsaw Pact invasion clearly disrupted deliveries such that some issues cannot be located in German collections. Ultimately, I was able to locate and consult each issue of the newspaper from its inception in 1951 to the end of my investigation with 1990 by piecing together a run from the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, and the Ústí nad Labem / Aussig city archives. The latter organization received the bound copies that had been in the newspaper's editorial offices in Prague after the paper closed down and lost its office space in 2005. Even that run has serious gaps resulting from various mishaps when the paper relocated its editorial offices at various times during its existence.

Working with this newspaper requires going to it. There are no significant portions of it on microfilm—the Library of Congress has a smattering of no consequence; nor has it been digitized, other than a few pages from after 1990 available only within the IP range of the Czech National Library. Moreover, there are no other traditional access mechanisms for it such as an index. The technique I followed was therefore dictated by need and quite primitive. I requested the volumes in sequence, then inspected each page of each issue by hand to identify literary texts and record them in ProCite, at the time a common bibliographic citation management software. Poems were relatively easy to identify given their typographic manifestation on a newspaper page, while identifying short stories and literary essays often required reading first paragraphs (or more) to assess genre. Additionally, it was immediately evident, as this work commenced, that the newspaper

represented a rich opportunity to glean a great deal of other information about the community. Collecting this information greatly decreased the rate at which it was possible to flip through in search of literature, yet in hindsight it was a wise expenditure of time as it became evident that, however ideologically tainted, the newspaper was the primary source for information on the Verbliebene, not just a useful source for tracking their literary aspirations.

Gubrium and Holstein, paraphrasing Emerson, refer to such unstructured and unplanned notes as "jottings" to distinguish them from structured ethnographic field notes. They can lead to what Gubrium and Holstein call analytic inspiration, ultimately becoming a structured source when sorted and arranged that can then be approached with a specific investigative purpose (2013, 13). I will expand on this point in a subsequent section.

Another complicating factor that slowed progress while I was compiling the bibliography was the presence of literature from writers who were not part of the Verbliebene community. This category includes writers from the GDR and the FRG, as well as writers from previous eras and German translations of Czech writers. It was often impossible, at a glance, to know if the author of a piece was in scope or out of scope, a challenge compounded by the practice of slavicizing German women's last names (e.g., Mayer becomes Mayerová). In 1998-1999, when I compiled the bulk of this bibliography, the Web was still a comparatively primitive information source, with many of the resources we now consult daily to supplement our knowledge and perform basic fact checking—e.g., Wikipedia, Google Books—yet to materialize. I relied upon my own knowledge of German literature to disqualify some writers, as well as on occasional editorial clues in the newspaper that would reveal a writer's origins and current location. I also compiled lists of writers whom I initially included in the bibliography despite having doubts, consulting occasionally with Ingrid Pavel, a long-time journalist and editor at the PVz, who in turn relied on her own knowledge to determine whether specific writers lived in Czechoslovakia when they wrote for the paper. This process of eliminating out-of-scope writers never ends; while preparing the biographical notes included in chapter three it was possible to rule out another set of writers. This last-minute sorting was possible given the emergence of textually fulsome sites such as Wikipedia and mass digitization projects—e.g., Google Books, the Internet Archive, and other projects both within and without libraries—that have exposed, at least in snippet form, millions of pages of texts to Web search engines.

Working with the newspaper was also critical for learning about the personalities in the Verbliebene community, as well as for identifying the few writers whose international profile granted them access to foreign publishers (mainly in the GDR). There were also occasional notices about forthcoming books from writers in the community. These pointers from the newspaper enabled me to conduct research in other libraries and sources to locate potential titles. Not surprisingly, given the general difficulty of getting a work into print in the Soviet bloc, many of these announced books apparently subsequently failed to materialize. Of the several dozen monographic titles in the bibliography, the path to most originated in knowledge gleaned from the newspaper.

Using bound volumes of newspapers imposed limitations on the research. It was impossible, for example, to make copies or images of the literary works, as would have been possible with microfilm. It also meant always going to the volumes, whether in Berlin, Munich, or Ústí nad Labem / Aussig, whereas, again, with microfilm it would theoretically be possible to request film through interlibrary loan. In the late 1990s, digital photography was still generally unavailable to the general consumer; moreover, reading room policies at the time prohibited photography of any type, a not uncommon issue in many archives and libraries. Further analysis of the impact of library and archive policy on research appears in chapter four, but the issue is recorded here to explain the absence of an extensive full-text corpus to accompany the bibliography.

As noted, I compiled the bulk of the bibliography in 1998-1999 under the auspices of a DAAD-funded research year in Berlin, with a brief research trip in early 2000 to pursue issues that emerged after reviewing the year's work with some hindsight. A subsequently funded visit in 2006 enabled me to visit the libraries in Munich and Ústí nad Labem / Aussig to close gaps that I had noted during this earlier research. In many ways, the search never ends; even as I prepare this manuscript, I find myself discovering new threads and pointers, which has led me to include new works in the bibliography. This need for revision and expansion is a common aspect of most bibliographies, regardless of purpose. In sum, although the bibliography consists of fewer than 1,100 entries, well over a year of research time went directly into the compilation of the bibliography.

Bibliography as scholarly contribution

Similar to the confusion around classifying bibliography, there is disagreement among bibliographic theorists around the question of whether bibliography is a science, an art, a craft, or some combination of the above. Most writers on the topic avoid drawing a conclusion on this question, adhering instead to two broad consensual points. The first is that regardless of bibliographic type, bibliographies demand a significant investment of effort and scholarly acumen (yet with the promise of very little immediate return or gratification). Bibliography as a practice, among other demands, requires domain knowledge, language skills, facility with arcane library systems, a taste for small details, and no small degree of obsession. Descriptions of these requirements often include self-deprecating asides about the need for both masochistic dedication and the willingness to toil in obscurity for no reward. Harmon poses a rhetorical question that this writer would rather not answer: "What really intelligent individual would spend hours leafing through the files of a daily newspaper or issues of periodicals for a single minor contribution just to be able to list it?" (1998, 11).

In a more serious vein, Schneider stresses that "the more attention it pays to critical work, to selection, to consideration of the content … and to determination of the place of the book in scholarly and intellectual history, the greater will be its claim to scientific character, comparable to that of the sciences it approximates" (1961, 23). Harner agrees, noting that a bibliography should be a "thorough, accurate, and usable contribution to scholarship," which requires "the determination, meticulousness, energy, time, critical acumen, and literary detective skills that one associates with the best scholarship of any kind" (2000, 35). Although they explicitly consider bibliography scholarship, neither delves into potentially more direct connections to specific forms of scholarly investigation.

The other point on which bibliographic theorists find consensus is that bibliography, if it is a science, is not an end in itself, but an auxiliary or ancillary science intended to facilitate others' scholarly work. Willoughby typifies this stance, asserting that a bibliography "serves its true function when it is an efficient tool to solve problems in history, literature or some like subject" (1957, 17). The bibliography presented here, as the research questions would suggest, is a resource for others to use for their own explorations—the traditional role of a bibliography per Willoughby and others—but I also created it with the deliberate intention

to explore research questions in parallel to its compilation, i.e., I was functioning as both bibliographer and researcher at the same time. My interest was in the artefactual and evidentiary value of recording and interpreting these texts, albeit not in the sense of literary scholarship, but in terms of their social and cultural significance. This approach suggests that bibliography, aside from having its own inherent techniques and methods, can itself be a research method, one that I earlier referred to as ethnographic bibliography.

Ethnographic Methodology

Bibliography as an ethnographic method

This research project began with a typically abductive moment: one sees clear evidence that the expulsion was not complete, which simply does not align with the prevailing popular and scholarly assumptions. This disjunction led to the formulation of a research project to attempt to document the existence of the community. One could pursue this research employing various disciplinary models, approaching it as historical inquiry or applying political theory, among other possibilities. As a trained literary scholar and a librarian, I chose to explore this topic by framing it within those two domains and working from the simple hypothesis that if a German community remained behind after the expulsions then its members would seek to maintain and cultivate their culture. Specifically, the goal was to gather evidence of this cultural activity, locating literary texts and recording them in a structured bibliography. Given my scholarly training and the nature of published works—texts tend to land in libraries more often than not—it seemed most promising to seek literary texts to document this one aspect of the community's cultural existence. While developing the topic, a shorthand I applied to the work was "cultural reclamation" to reflect the sense of making a cohesive whole from scattered pieces.

As the work progressed, I came to understand it as more ethnographic in nature; it was more cultural description than reclamation or reconstruction. This flexibility in approach is not atypical. Gubrium and Holstein insist that "analytic inspiration" is an important aspect of qualitative research (or of any research). They emphasize the need to engage with data while it is being collected, not only after it has been collected, to foster analytic inspiration, which "not only provides insight, tentative or otherwise, but also supplies a roadmap for how to move along in the research" (2014, 4). When I embarked on this project, aside from a working hypothesis I had no sense of what texts I would uncover, or how many. As they

began to accumulate, therefore, patterns emerged and required interpretation, while the rest of the newspaper around the literary contributions provided copious contextualizing information that also demanded sorting and analysis.

Bibliography may be the primary tool used to record the data uncovered, but the research project itself and its attendant research questions are largely ethnographic in nature. Broadly conceived, the purpose of ethnography is to study culture. Clifford Geertz assigns further nuance to this definition with his concept of thin versus thick description, clearly indicating that thick description is preferred, as "... the object of ethnography [is] a stratified hierarchy of meaningful structures" (1975, 7). This means not just seeing the behaviour (thin description), but capturing the nuances of the behaviour ("piled up structures of inference") (Ibid., 7). This notion parallels Schneider's and Harner's assertions that bibliography as a practice requires more than simply assiduously recording the details of publication. For a project such as mine, it is essential to apply one's knowledge of literature, noting how it is produced, who gets published (and who does not), how much gets published, where it appears in the newspaper, etc., to capture Geertz's notion of nuance as piled up structures of inference, i.e., to provide a thick description.

Beyond the need for rich accounts rather than superficial readings, Geertz also underscores the investigative aspects of ethnography that are driven by the researcher's curiosity. Ethnography does not afford one a complete picture, but rather "is like trying to read (in the sense of 'construct a reading of') a manuscript--foreign, faded, full of ellipses, incoherencies, suspicious emendations, and tendentious commentaries, but written not in conventionalized graphs of sound but in transient examples of shaped behavior" (1975, 14). The entire corpus encompassed by my bibliography represents such a manuscript, not in the literal sense, but a body of evidence about a community that invites interpretation, yet it is explicitly known to be only a partial record, literally faded and full of gaps and omissions. Ethnography is an inexact practice at best, as Willig points out: "The ethnographer rejects the role of expert and this means that, although theoretically grounded, ethnographic research aspires to maintain a flexible and reflexive stance, remaining explorative and open to changes in perspective throughout the research" (2013, 14). Willig further defines the ethnographic approach:

> ... the ethnographer does have a research question in mind; however, this question is really little more than an acknowledgement of what motivates

> the researcher to commence the research in the first place rather than a theoretically derived problem statement. The aim of ethnographic research is to obtain an insider view of a particular dimension of people's everyday lives by participating, overtly or covertly, in it for a sustained period of time. (2013, 14)

The period of ethnographic observation for this project is forty years, post facto, but it is in many ways observation from a consistent vantage point, that of a reader of the community's newspaper. Ethnographic theorists generally allow that newspapers (and similar media) represent a useful source for ethnographers. In the Verbliebene community, given the lack of other formal communication channels, it serves as an unusually uniform and consistent connector for the community. Murchison acknowledges that "cultural artifacts can also be analyzed as proxy representations of phenomena to which the ethnographer has limited or indirect access," while cautioning that the ethnographer must think "carefully about what was and was not preserved, which perspectives are highlighted, and how context influenced what is written or recorded …" (2010, 161, 164). Murchison here reframes and reiterates Geertz's notion of a constructed reading of a manuscript in more practical terms.

When Geertz was writing about ethnography, researchers were generally inclined to study "foreign" cultures, i.e., non-Western, non-industrialized societies. He explicitly acknowledges that anthropology has a fascination with the exotic, which "displaces the dulling sense of familiarity" (1975, 14). He does note that anthropology can be applied to the culture of which the anthropologist is part—in this case, the broader Western and European contexts—and even asserts its "profound importance," but then sets aside the notion and returns to Indonesian examples from his own work (Ibid., 14). This would perhaps explain, in part, the lack of scholarly interest paid to the German community in post-war Czechoslovakia, as its members are to some degree the antithesis of exotic: a remnant community with few major figures or signature characteristics. In the intervening decades, scholarship in general has evolved, with postcolonial and postmodern discourses disrupting such paternalistic fascination with perceived exoticism. This trend even extends into libraries, where ethnographic studies of user behaviours are increasingly standard fare, following the pioneering work of Foster and Gibbons at the University of Rochester (2007).

The near complete lack of ethnographic studies of the Verbliebene illustrates Geertz's comment about "dulling familiarity." One of the few ethnographic studies of this

community—Eisch's *Grenzland Niemandsland: Eine ethnographische Annäherung an die Deutschen in Böhmen*—employs a more traditional ethnographic approach. Eisch embedded herself in the community and conducted structured interviews. While reading her work, it occurred to me that this approach defines ethnography geographically: I travel to a specific place and study the people there. She chose the place, not the specific subjects. My work, in contrast, approaches the community along a more social axis. Rather than being concerned with a geographic location or a point in time, other than the broad terms defined by my scope, I study a group of people connected via a social thread, namely, they all write literature.

Ethnography versus historical analysis

Conducting research on the Verbliebene community presents the researcher with a challenge, namely, the risk of obscuring one's own research in an effort to portray accurately the historical context. The history of Czech-German relations is both long and fraught with conflict, reaching its climax with the German occupation of the Czech lands during the Nazi period. As such, the body of extant scholarship on Czech-German relations is extensive. A researcher engaging with any aspect of this history will inevitably feel the strong gravitational pull of the larger history. If one wishes to conduct research on post-war Czech-German relations, as I have, the work requires a thorough grounding in what happened during the occupation. Understanding the occupation phase of the relationship requires a grasp of the first Czechoslovak Republic, and so on down a deep rabbit hole. All historical research benefits from such thorough grounding, but in the case of Czech-German relations the seductive pull of the entire saga is intense due to the unresolved nature of their "breakup" in 1945-1946 and the related dominant popular discourse of blame and retribution. Moreover, to approach such a sensitive topic from an ethnographic perspective without acknowledging and addressing the historical context seems both impossible and unwise. As part of this research project, therefore, I have read extensively in the historical literature. Moreover, parallel to compiling the literary bibliography I read newspaper issues from 1951-1990 from the vantage point of 1999; thus the project at times felt more like history than ethnography, the latter of which assumes, as a seminal feature, direct contact between researcher and subject. While I do present a sketch of the historical context in chapter two, I do so to position my work clearly and to provide readers with a framework

for understanding how the Verbliebene came into being and the conditions under which they existed. To explain the resulting methodological intersections between history and ethnography and to confront and deflect a solely historical reading of this research, I attempt here to demarcate the distinctions between historical and ethnographic methodologies as they apply to my approach to this project.

This intersection between historical analysis and ethnography is not uncommon. Eisch addresses it directly in her ethnographic study of a small group of Verbliebene, suggesting that neither methodology supplants the other, but that there can be productive interplay between the two. She astutely observes,

> Natürlich soll der hier vorgeschlagene ethnographische und alltagskulturelle Perspektivenwechsel keinesfalls historische Forschung ersetzen. Im Kontext des gegenwärtig Vorfindlichen aber läßt sich durchaus auch manches Quellenmaterial neu und anders lesen — und sei es nur im gebauten Forschungsumfeld von Archivgebäuden, Häusern und Gassen, im erinnernden und kommentierenden Plaudern des Archivars oder dem abendlichen Austausch beim Bier. (1999, 302)

Here she captures well the nature and progress of my own research project. Lange, echoing Eisch and writing on the practice of comparative-historical analysis—meta-studies of multiple, related phenomena that aspire to nomothetic conclusions, discusses the application of multiple methodologies and suggests that

> … historical and ethnographic methods are commonly used to analyze the same types of phenomena, the main difference being that ethnographic methods analyze contemporary examples whereas historical methods analyze examples from the past. In this way, data collection and type of data are commonly the only factors separating ethnographic methods from historical methods. (2013, 13)

I engaged both methods in my research, yet the manner in which the project unfolded contradicts Lange's neat delineation of ethnography as contemporary and history as the past. Although the period of study for the bibliography is 1945-1990, both the newspaper and the Vertriebene community existed well beyond 1990. The former appeared until 2006, while the latter continues on, albeit with ever diminishing numbers. This state of affairs has enabled me to continue to "observe" the community for nearly two decades as it continues to evolve and thus to sharpen my analysis and to add nuance to the information I gleaned from historical sources. The work I did to compile the bibliography seems in many ways anthropological, rather than historical, a slight paradox given that the majority of the work

took place in libraries and archives. Rather than doing the work across space and time, as ethnographic or anthropological methodologies would typically dictate, I use the medium of a newspaper to reduce forty years of field collecting into a year spent reviewing the entire era in distilled form. This approach might be best described, in its intent, as post facto ethnography, pursued using the trade tools of historical analysis, i.e., seeking information via libraries and archives. It is not entirely historical, however; interviews led to insights and revelations that led to further texts and aided in the formulation of hypotheses concerning developments within the community. There was productive interplay between the two methods.

Lange never fully disentangles ethnography from historical analysis, but does suggest that the scope and object of a study in some ways determines which comes more to the fore. He allows that "ethnography can and is used for within-case analysis and is therefore part of the comparative-historical methodological toolkit," but qualifies his statement by adding that "comparative-historical researchers only rarely use it with great rigor, however, because ethnographic methods are usually used for very descriptive works that attempt to increase understanding about a particular group of people, their livelihoods, and their culture" (2013, 15). The purpose of my research project, as my research questions indicate, is to document the Verbliebene community's culture, not to situate it, per se, in its twentieth-century historical context or to comment extensively on that broader context. Additionally, the methods employed—collecting creative works, conducting interviews, exploring interpersonal connections—point more toward ethnographic study than historical analysis. More broadly, my reading of Lange makes clear that this project pursues nearly strictly ideographic ends (describing a specific phenomenon), not nomothetic ends, which are the purpose of comparative-historical analysis. My study could serve, however, as a possible component of just such a nomothetic approach, e.g., were a researcher writing more comparatively about the fate of displaced minority populations in post-war societies.

Geertz also emphasizes the place that any inquiry has in the context of the broader scholarly enterprise:

> Rather than following a rising curve of cumulative findings, cultural analysis breaks up into a disconnected yet coherent sequence of bolder and bolder sorties. Studies do build on other studies, not in the sense that they take up where the others leave off, but in the sense that, better

> informed and conceptualized, they plunge more deeply into the same things. (1975, 25)

This underscores the notion that my thick description of one aspect of culture creates a gateway and something of a map that other scholars can follow. The lack of antecedent studies, however, made it challenging to get very far with the analysis. Geertz wryly observes that "every serious cultural analysis starts from a sheer beginning and ends where it manages to get before exhausting its intellectual impulse" (Ibid., 25). While my study provides significant ethnographic depth on one particular aspect of the community, it falls short, by design, of historical analysis for its failure to craft a broader historical narrative from the data; instead it merely suggests, in fragmentary and inconclusive assertions in the subsequent chapter, potential historical interpretations. From this perspective, it is possible to conceive of the study as a useful starting point for an historian and a framework for further inquiry.

Acknowledging bias in ethnography

As noted earlier in the Definitions and Terminology section, one cannot pretend to approach this topic from an unbiased viewpoint. In addition to explaining one's use of terminology, with respect to research methodology it is also essential to acknowledge bias more directly and to engage in consciously reflexive practice. May and Perry make clear that bias is inescapable: "As researchers, there is no view we can derive that is free from social position given our participation in the social world" (2013, 2). As a German speaker whose project originated as a German literature research project and as an individual raised in the United States during the Cold War, my predisposition to empathize with the community's plight as a reviled German-speaking minority and to dismiss out of hand the hyperbolic Communist rhetoric of the newspaper is clear to me. For one, the German speaker learns, when speaking German outside of its "native" context, i.e., Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, that to do so is to become the target of seemingly universal anti-German sentiments; put simply, every conversation proves that Godwin's law wasn't made by the Internet,[3] but has likely existed since the Second World War. With regard to European Communism, moreover, it is simply impossible for a modern liberal who knows how the

[3] Godwin's Law, coined by Mike Godwin in 1990, holds that "as an online discussion grows longer, the probability of a comparison involving Nazis or Hitler approaches one." (*Wired*, October 1, 1994)

Cold War ends to read such pathos-inflected writing with anything but a cynical eye. “How could anyone ever have believed such tripe” becomes the default mode of reading, which deflects and distracts the eye from reading closer to grasp what was perhaps not so bluntly articulated when it appeared between the obligatory rhetorical flourishes.

This personal connection can be an asset. May and Perry summarize feminist theorists when they argue “that a critical and insightful gaze does not come from a position of disinterest from which the researcher works, but that interest itself comes from the advantage of ‘being engaged’” (2013, 4). Reflexivity in research acknowledges the presence of bias and encourages researchers to approach their subject and their data with questions but also to use their knowledge and grounding to support their inquiry. Willig underscores this point by noting that “... reflexivity is not a method, but a way of thinking or critical ethos, the role of which is to aid interpretation, translation, and representation. ... it is an iterative and continuous characteristic of good research practice” (2013, 5). The sheer length of this project, from its first articulation in 1997, through the field work in 1998-1999, and including the many follow-up projects and activities in subsequent years, has made it an exercise in reflection and reconsideration. Not only have my own views been tempered (and shaped) by subsequent readings of events and research produced by others, but a window of time has passed that allows some of the loose hypotheses one formulates as asides within a research project to be observed in a nearly longitudinal sense. One such hypothesis was that this community would not enjoy a “vogue” period where it became a pet project of, say, the German media. Other than in the brief period when Lenka Reinerová enjoyed fame, both the general public as well as the researcher community remain largely unaware of this population and its fate. In other words, the first hypothesis turned out to be correct. Another hypothesis that has been “tested” and proven is that the indigenous German population would continue to decline rapidly in numbers, with the “German” community being increasingly made up of individuals moving to the Czech Republic for various personal and business reasons. The signs for this shift were already evident in the early 1990s, and the trend has continued.[4]

[4] A precise figure for the size of the Verbliebene community, as explained in the following chapter, has always been elusive. Recent figures for Czech citizens claiming German ethnicity would suggest that the community is approximately 15-20% of its size immediately after the expulsions.

Chapter 2: The Verbliebene Community in its Czechoslovak Context

This chapter seeks to serve three main purposes. The first is to extract the history of the Verbliebene community from its role as a nearly invisible thread in the dominant discourse of the Vertreibung and the Vertriebene by highlighting how and why this subsuming typically occurs. I then provide sufficient general historical background of German settlement in the Czech lands to enable a reader unfamiliar or only passingly familiar with the broader historical context to locate the Verbliebene in this wider frame. Lastly, on the basis of information gleaned mainly from the community's newspaper as well as from interviews and other media sources, I sketch social and political developments within the Verbliebene community. I take up cultural issues related to their literary ambitions in the next chapter.

Shifting the Focus from the Vertriebene to the Verbliebene

As I have repeatedly encountered in my research into the Verbliebene community, conversations that begin with discussions of their existence and fate almost inevitably transform into much broader discussions of twentieth-century Czech-German relations, typically dominated by themes and issues more relevant to the Vertriebene. Given the convulsions of the first half of the previous century, not least the unprecedented chain of horrors set in motion by the 1938 Munich Agreement that ended with the expulsion of millions of Germans from Czechoslovakia (and many millions more from other nations), it is understandable that it is difficult to have a rational, scholarly conversation about an easily dismissed tangential issue such as the Germans who remained in Czechoslovakia after 1946. That their numbers have steadily decreased due to emigration, assimilation, and aging means that their voice, never loud, has only grown quieter with time.

The Verbliebene as Political Football

The phenomenon of Verbliebene as invisible people certainly applies to public discourse and the media, but to no less degree to much of the scholarship of the era. Even a recent comprehensive study of Czech-German relations, Houžvička's *Czechs and Germans 1848-2004: the Sudeten Question and the Transformation of Central Europe*, which examines every political twitch in painstaking detail, remains largely silent with regard to

the Verbliebene, tacitly asserting that they have played no role in Czech-German relations worth mentioning. Other scholars acknowledge the existence of the community, yet do so only to support their arguments in favour of a particular point of view. For example, many German scholars of the 1950s and 1960s, who were often themselves Vertriebene, openly acknowledge the existence of the Verbliebene, but frequently only as a vehicle for criticizing Czechoslovak policy and/or to lament the condition of the towns and industry that they, i.e., the Vertriebene, had been forced to abandon. A particularly illustrative example of this tendency is Urban's *Die sudetendeutschen Gebiete nach 1945*, which details over hundreds of pages the state of every industry, painting a resolutely negative picture of Czech policy and abilities. These German Vertriebene histories also generally adhere to statistics for the number of victims during the Vertreibung and its related atrocities that have since been debunked by less biased research. Tampke concedes that while it is understandable that lay accounts would display the influence of personal experience and bias, the same cannot be said for German historiography of the period, which is rife with the same bias (2003, 90).

Scholars writing from the opposite, i.e., Czechoslovak, perspective often merely swing the pendulum in the other direction. Luža's oft-cited *The Transfer of the Sudeten Germans: A Study of Czech-German Relations, 1933-1962* presents statistics intended to minimize Czech brutality and generally excuses Czech actions by positioning them as equal and opposite reactions to Nazi crimes. Even a post-1989 Czech historian as thorough as Staněk, who appropriately refrains from Luža-esque tit-for-tat accounting, cannot quite bring himself to condemn forcefully his compatriots' actions. Staněk asserts, without offering any substantial evidence, that the will to resist the temptation to inflict gratuitous harm upon innocent Germans was present in Czechs, but that it simply had not been possible to act quickly and decisively upon this will. Using an odd turn of phrase for an historian, he refers to Czech society as "doch verhältnismäßig zivilisiert," leaving the reader to muse upon what distinguishes Czechs from any other society (2003, 224). In sum, this genre of scholarship may well acknowledge the existence of the Verbliebene, but generally only in service of arguments lobbed in the direction of those writing from the opposing point of view. Examples abound, but it suffices here to note the general phenomenon; constructing a more thorough accounting would merely underscore, in ironic fashion, the extent to which the Vertreibung casts a shadow over any related topic.

A People with No History

Further confounding our ability to see the Verbliebene and their history has been their chronic inability to establish a voice for their community. After the individuals who had built their political or literary reputations before the war—Weiskopf, Fürnberg, Kisch, Kreibich, et al.—had all passed from the scene by the end of the 1950s, new leaders and voices who could speak for the community failed to emerge. Eisch, in her ethnographic study, states flatly that the community never had any representation in public discourse. Further complicating their position, she points out, is that by not being expelled, they lost their own history, which the Vertriebene wholly co-opted for their own purposes; the Verbliebene passively permitted the Vertriebene to tell their story, seeing themselves as "extras" in a larger historical drama (1999, 285). As a consequence, the Verbliebene, as she encountered them in the 1990s, were no longer capable of defining themselves as an ethnic community. Their experience of the years between 1938-1945 and subsequent life as a marginal minority in Czechoslovakia made any such national notions foreign to their way of thinking (Ibid., 299). Not least, it also bears mentioning that aside from the newspaper, almost no documentary evidence of Verbliebene society and institutions exists in the form of written and structured archives. As Annelies Marhoul, a Verbliebene from Dubí / Eichwald put it succinctly: "Wir sind die Hinterbliebenen und Nichtbeachteten" (Koch 1993).

While acknowledging the fundamental correctness of Eisch's assessment, that she conducted her ethnographic research in the 1990s sets it in a different context from the ethnographic bibliography approach that I employ. The act of writing literature has many purposes and motivations, but given the autobiographical and realist tendencies inherent in the vast majority of the texts I discovered and documented, it seems reasonable to assert that, aside from writing at a much earlier—and perhaps still more optimistically inclined—point in the post-war period, the individuals I study had much closer contact to their history, temporally speaking. Additionally, being inclined to write, they were also engaging in acts of reflection and processing that others did not experience. Incessant calls from the Verbliebene for more literature and more publishing opportunities—not only by authors but from readers—may well be expressions of a desire to reestablish an identity and a history. Given that this demand was never met—i.e., that the Czech government successfully constrained cultural expression—Eisch's assessment of the Verbliebene state of mind in the

1990s would be a nearly inevitable outcome. Eisch expresses the view of many observers of this community, including myself, when she asserts that there is no foundation in the post-revolutionary Czech and Slovak Republics for the continued preservation of a German ethnic group (Ibid., 301).

Given the lack of documentary evidence and the general invisibility of the Verbliebene in which they are themselves complicit, it becomes more evident that the lack of scholarship on the Verbliebene is perhaps less a question of neglect than a reflection of a general lack of information. King, in the introduction to his narrowly focused history of Czech-German relations in České Budějovice / Budweis, delves into a criticism of historical practice, noting that many new and interesting insights have come from people in other disciplines (2002, 9). This helps frame the research I conducted. One of the core elements of the discipline of library science is recording what we perceive to be the "historical record," i.e., the preservation of materials that historians will need in order to write history. Given the lack of such material about the Verbliebene, they struggle, of course, to exist in a historiographical sense. At best, they hover on the periphery as a footnote or an anecdote, as in, "we (historians) know they exist, but cannot prove or document this with evidence, so we move on." This casual treatment has led to a jumble of assertions about this community in the historical literature, ranging from fairly simple matters such as its size to more complex issues concerning who was permitted to stay. This chapter is intended, in part, to navigate this fraught landscape of contradictory or outright biased information to present a balanced view of the Verbliebene that acknowledges these contradictions and emphasizes consensus views that have emerged in recent years based on collaborative Czech-German scholarship. Lustick refers to this as "triage," which means acknowledging the conflicts in secondary sources rather than obscuring them with an arbitrary selection of resources that fit an argument (cited in Lange 2013, 8).

Historical Background

The historiography on the German presence in the Czech lands and on Czech-German relations is copious. This brief historical sketch provides necessary contextual background to enable the reader unfamiliar with this history to understand the contours of this community and the events that led to the expulsion that created the Verbliebene community.

Before the Twentieth Century

German settlement in the Czech lands stretches back over 800 years, to when the Přemyslid kings invited Germans to settle in areas that now fall within the territory of the Czech Republic. These areas were historically never completely geographically contiguous, but rather scattered along what are now the Czech borderlands, as well as in several small islands further inland. German settlement in what is now Slovakia was set in motion via other actors and means, but followed a similar course and also stretches back hundreds of years. [5]

As with much of Central Europe, the Reformation and the wars it set in motion did not leave these regions untouched. A seminal event that influenced the future of the relationship between Czechs and Germans in particular was the Battle of White Mountain in 1620, where the Protestant Bohemian army was decisively defeated by the Catholic armies of the Holy Roman Empire. This not only led Catholicism to supplant Protestantism as the dominant faith in the region, but also essentially crushed the Czech-speaking nobility, with German nobility and language dominating the region for nearly two centuries, until the Czech National Revival or Awakening reasserted Czech linguistic, cultural, and political ambitions. Nineteenth-century Central Europe saw the development of nationalist aspirations in many subjugated peoples, which in turn invoked nationalist responses from those in power. By the end of the century, antagonisms between Germans and Czechs were open, with anti-German (and anti-Jewish) riots erupting in 1897 and subsequent years leading up to the First World War. Broadly speaking, antagonisms between nationalities in the Austrian empire were often exacerbated by failed Habsburg policies. Conflicts between nationalities in the monarchy were actually struggles of succession in a crumbling order, leading to the creation of nationalist positions and demands that prefigured if not directly precipitated many of the conflicts that ensued in the twentieth century (King 2002, 5). When the monarchy collapsed, the void was filled immediately with national movements and camps to succeed the failed state. In the Czech and Slovak lands, this conflict only ends with the expulsion of the vast majority of the German population after 1945.

[5] Although the scope of the literary bibliography is German literature from Czechoslovakia, this chapter focuses nearly entirely on Czech-German interactions. While the history of German presence in the territory that is now the Slovak Republic also extends back many centuries, it is far less notable as a factor in 20th-century events. The paucity of information I note with regard to the Verbliebene in the Czech lands is even greater when it comes to Slovakia. Until 1990, there was virtually no mention of the Germans living in the Slovak lands in *Aufbau und Frieden* or the *Prager Volkszeitung*.

The First Czechoslovak Republic

In addition to having no historical precedent to guide it, the First Republic was born in a moment of intense anti-German sentiment and thus was perhaps predestined to become the next ethnic flashpoint. Many prominent Germans, including most of the German-speaking nobility, resisted or at least resented the formation of the First Republic, leading to a number of violent clashes in the Republic's early years, echoing the pre-war riots. One complaint of the German population was that despite the fact that they represented a major portion of the population and collectively owned a disproportionate share of the nation's industrial capacity, they tended to receive less than an equitable share of government contracts. Another irritant for the German population was the government policy of filling public-service roles in predominantly German regions with Czechs in an attempt to dilute German influence. This led to a dramatic increase in the Czech-speaking population in what had been largely German regions.

More generally, the German population of Czechoslovakia felt politically disadvantaged and discriminated against by the policies of the Czechoslovak Government in the First Republic. The German population participated in government, including proportionate representation in legislative bodies and even a number of ministerial roles as part of governing coalitions. There were, however, no joint political parties among Czechs, Slovaks, or Germans, other than the Communist Party, which had itself formed as nationally separate entities in the early Republic, but merged under pressure from the Comintern in 1921. This political separation failed to achieve a stable parity, resulting in an atmosphere where the Germans expressed sentiments of repression even though they had full rights as citizens. In the 1925 election, the German Social Democrats (Deutsche sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei – DSAP) and the conservative Bund der Landwirte were the two strongest parties in the German population, while the Communists also received strong support from the German population as well. The global economic crisis and the Nazi party's ascendancy in Germany shifted the politics within the German population in Czechoslovakia as well, reducing the influence of these moderate and leftist parties and leading to the rise of the Sudetendeutsche Heimatfront as a home for all right-wing nationalists.

During the First Republic, the term Sudetendeutsch[6], first coined in the latter decades of the previous century, came into common use to describe the German population of the Czech borderlands *in toto*. This linguistic shift, which successfully lumped a diverse and widely distributed German population into one collective, yet largely artificial identity, represented a victory for nationalists on both sides in their quest to reduce the conflict to an historical struggle between Czechs and Germans. Some intellectuals—e.g., Egon Erwin Kisch and F.C. Weiskopf—abhorred the appellation Sudetendeutsch, while others such as Louis Fürnberg showed themselves more willing to accept it, at least before the war.

Henlein/Nazi Era

The National Socialist rise to power in Germany in 1933 exacerbated an already tense relationship between the Czechoslovak state and its domestic German population. On the German side, it encouraged those who harboured visions of autonomy if not outright secession, including Konrad Henlein, whose name ultimately became synonymous with Sudetendeutsche fascism. Henlein founded the Sudetendeutsche Heimatfront in 1933, which became the Sudetendeutsche Partei (SdP) in 1935 in order to take part in national elections. Parallel to the founding of the Heimatfront, the Czechoslovak government banned two parties, the Deutsche Nationalsozialistische Partei and the Deutsche Nationalpartei, which abetted the rapid growth of the Heimatfront, turning it into a gathering point for all nationalist Germans.

The SdP received substantial political and financial support from the NSDAP in Germany, further fueling their rise and expansion. In the May 1935 election, they received just under 1.25 million votes, far outpolling the German Social Democrats with approximately 300,000 as well as the pan-Czechoslovak Communists with 850,000, gaining the most seats of any party in the entire Republic with 15.2% of the overall vote for the Chamber of Deputies and 15% in the Senate. Emboldened by this electoral victory, Henlein increased the demands coming from the SdP, calling for full autonomy. In municipal elections in May 1938, the SdP received 80- 90% of the vote in many communities, a figure oft cited after the war by those wishing to paint the entire German population of

[6] The term Sudeten or Sudetendeutsch supplanted the previous usage of terms such as Deutschböhmen and Deutschmährer to describe Germans living in the Czech lands. It stems from the name of a mountain range in Northern Bohemia (German: Sudeten; Czech: Sudety, although this is rarely used now), and therefore is geographically imprecise but nevertheless quickly took hold as a shorthand and persists to the present.

Czechoslovakia as fascists. This usage ignores, however, that these elections were held in a time of crisis and increasing terror against the left, with Social Democrats and Communists nearly completely marginalized. Nazi propaganda directed at international audiences, such as Richter's *No Oppression of the Sudeten-Germans in Czechoslovakia? Czechoslovakians Reply to the Czechoslovakian Government* (1937), provided cover for these actions. In response to SdP agitation, Czech troops had mobilized to fend off an anticipated German invasion, exacerbating a tense situation in border regions as Czech soldiers now came in close contact with Henlein supporters, resulting in multiple shootings and some deaths. Nevertheless, the municipal elections do reflect, democratically conducted or not, the overwhelmingly pro-Nazi tenor in the Czech borderlands prior to the Munich Agreement. Henlein exploited his party's popularity and its German backing to press the Prague government to accept a range of demands within the framework of a proposed nationalities statute. Despite the presence of the German military in Austria after the Anschluss and the Reich government's incessant pressure on the Czech government to accede to Henlein's demands, the Czechs refused to do so, creating an impasse that the Munich Agreement resolved in dramatic fashion without Czech participation.

The events of the subsequent seven years are generally well known. The Munich Agreement at the end of September 1938 forced Czechoslovakia to concede its borderlands to the German Reich. The Nazis coerced a rump Czech government—the last democratically elected government headed by Beneš had largely gone into exile—into consenting to the occupation of their remaining territory in March 1939, leading to the establishment of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. As with Nazi occupation in other nations, this period was marked by brutal acts intended to terrorize the Czech populace into submission, albeit with the key difference that the former Czech lands—far from any front and lying beyond the range of Allied bombers—were long critical for the production of war materials, prompting the Nazis to pay critical Czech workers fair wages and offer them incentives such as vacations.

An important question to consider concerns the predominant view, in public discourse, that the Sudeten Germans were *all* Nazis who welcomed Hitler and wanted to go "Heim ins Reich." Given its electoral success, Henlein's SdP was the dominant political force, but assuming that all Henlein supporters were essentially Nazis is an oversimplification. Glassheim stresses that the 1933 Gleichschaltung that reorganized social life and

relationships in Germany on Nazi terms had been adopted by most Sudeten German organizations as well, making their members into instant "collaborators" in a legal sense if not entirely in actual fact (2005, 203). After the German occupation of the borderlands, SdP members did not instantly become members of the Nazi Party, either; rather, they had to apply for membership. Many, but not all, did apply for membership, but some were rejected for a variety of reasons, including having ambiguous national status. Before exonerating SdP members, however, one must consider how they actively pursued and arrested Social Democrats and others after the annexation, as well as the participation of many of them—alongside their Reich fellow citizens—in various atrocities during the occupation. The notion of collective German guilt, which justified and drove the post-war treatment of Germans across Central and Eastern Europe (and beyond), applied too easily to the Germans in Czechoslovakia; their collectivization as Sudeten Germans had obliterated other historically significant divisions and distinctions in their community, while the politics of the 1930s that spurred the growth of ultranationalist parties led to the mass popularity of the SdP. The behaviour and actions of Henlein and other SdP members during the war only exacerbated what would have already been considerable animosity on the part of the Czechs toward the Germans, and presented a convenient rhetorical framework through which to condemn all Germans as fascists after the war, fueling the expulsions.

(En)forcing Nationality

Before turning to the expulsions and their aftermath, we must consider more critically the challenge of assigning nationality to people living in these regions. As noted in the previous chapter, much of the writing on this era and these peoples relies upon fairly simple models stemming from census data and mathematical calculations in order to place groups into unambiguous national categories. Zahra, reflecting on her own and other recent scholarship, suggests that anyone writing "about German-Czech relations … without minimally exploring the question of who was a German and who was a Czech" is avoiding a central issue (2011, 270). While, for the purpose of compiling the literary bibliography, I was able, as noted in the previous chapter, to apply fairly straightforward filters—living in Czechoslovakia, writing in German—to declare texts in or out of scope, the intent in doing so was manifestly not to imply that authors would themselves uniformly identify as German.

This excursus both addresses Zahra's implicit challenge as well as establishes a proper context for interpreting demographic statistics.

National Indifference, Hermaphroditism, and Amphibianism

Historians writing from a national viewpoint, i.e., most mid- to late-twentieth-century German and Czech scholars, tend to view the Czech-German conflict in the arbitrarily bounded First Republic as an extension of the nationalist antagonisms of the nineteenth century. While that view has some validity, it ignores the fact that many individuals were ambivalent about nationality, being far more concerned with daily life and immediate needs. In recent years, historians writing from more distant temporal and geographic perspectives are critically reexamining the accepted nationalist narrative. Zahra, who bases her analysis on the years 1900-1948 to emphasize social continuity rather than building an argument strictly on major political events, articulates the notion of national indifference. Building on the work of Brugge, she asserts that in the previous century, little separated Czechs and Germans other than language, and that the animosity nationalist organizations invented to create "popular loyalties" was generally not present at the personal or communal level (2011, 4). She asserts that national indifference, fairly widespread given a high level of bilingualism and frequent intermarriage, was itself a driver of nationalism as it forced nationalist organizers to "devise and impose novel and increasingly disciplinary forms of national ascription or classification" (Ibid., 5). The problem with national indifference, she allows, is that it is challenging to document and study; it has no organizations, no monuments, no supporters, no propagandists. In her estimation, the sources historians generally rely upon conspire "to bury indifference to nationalism" (Ibid.). She specifically criticizes sources such as census data as a basis for historical analysis, given that a census forces a single choice upon a respondent and leaves no room for complex personal identity narratives. In turn, maps are created based on this data, which leads to the visual and geographic reification of divisive nationalist notions (Ibid., 6). The Czechoslovak censuses, for example, of 1921 and 1930 introduced the ability to declare "Jew" as nationality, but many opted not to do so (Bundesministerium 1957, 6). That Jews in the Czech lands of Bohemia and Moravia were largely secularized likely contributed to this choice (Čapková 2005, 10).

Further complicating the picture are manifestations of amphibianism or national hermaphroditism during this tense and dramatic period. The usage of amphibianism to describe those who could switch between German, Czech, Jewish, and other identities in Czechoslovakia stems from Nazi anthropologists (Bryant 2002, 684). Czech nationalists also used the term; both groups shared a common revulsion toward the practice and found it a sign of "defective moral character" (Zahra 2011, 264). Zahra, who introduces the term national hermaphroditism to avoid using the nationalists' preferred term, notes that individuals who have the ability to do so for reasons of heritage or language will often, when forced to do so as with a census, select nationality based on pragmatic considerations, such as personal advantage or safety: "Sometimes, 'eternity' lasted only as long as a political regime; sometimes it lasted until the 'other' nation made a better offer of welfare benefits" (Ibid., 269). Bryant calculates that since during the Nazi occupation one in 25 Czechs opted to become Reich citizens, i.e., to declare themselves Germans, this would mean that statistically speaking virtually all Czechs had a Reich relative (2002, 685). Moreover, neither Czech nor Nazi officials were capable of ascertaining definitively, in objective fashion, who was German, Czech, or Jew; this was nearly always a locally and personally determined matter, although both the Germans with the Nürnberg laws and the Czechs with post-war ration cards imposed rigid categories on those who were otherwise ambivalent (Ibid., 706). A post-war German scholar, engaging in the ritual number-crunching so common in that era that attempted to put individuals into national categories using dubious statistical sources (such as Reich census data), points out that between 1930 and 1955 the Czech population increased by 20% and the Slovak population by 50% while various minorities, primarily Germans and Hungarians, had seen drastic reductions (Reinisch 1957, 72). The latter numbers, of course, are attributable to mass expulsions, but Reinisch blithely ignores the fact that the tremendous growth in Czech and Slovak numbers—despite war losses and the many years of privation in that period—is likely largely attributable to hermaphroditism, where individuals switched nationalities to avoid an unpleasant fate or secure personal advantages.

King also criticizes earlier historians who fell into the trap of asserting that nationhood derived solely from national identities as they were articulated and shaped in the nineteenth century by those pursuing nationalist goals. In King's terms, these historians focus too intently on vertical separation by language and insufficiently on horizontal layers

of “corporative and socioeconomic solidarities,” which have “far more institutional anchoring and sociological significance” (2002, 7). He illustrates the social complexity of the era by pointing out that the Jewish population of Bohemia, although a well-defined group in the 1840s and earlier, had not subsequently developed into a “nation,” with many Jews becoming Czechs or Germans, converting to Christianity, or becoming “nationally Jewish,” i.e., Zionist (Ibid.). He summarizes his position by positing an alternative viewpoint: “ethnic groups are not national antecedents, but national products, projected ahistorically yet with history-making effect into the past” (Ibid., 8). From such a perspective, the founding of the First Republic in 1918, widely hailed by Czech nationalists and politicians as a victory for democracy and self-determination after centuries of imperial rule, seems instead a concession to Czech nationalist agendas in a period of intense pan-European anti-German sentiment.

Nationality is not a fluid concept for every individual. Many people, in any culture, neither struggle with nor question their nationality; nor do they change it as conditions evolve. Where cultures come in contact, however, particularly over longer periods of time and under conditions that encourage intermarriage and cooperation, a marginal group of greater or lesser size will flow easily between the two (or more) groups by virtue of linguistic or cultural competence. In the absence of polarizing external nationalist demands, as was the case in Bohemia before the nineteenth century, the “softened” boundary that this culturally mobile group maintains creates an unspectacular and peaceful form of coexistence. When nationalism asserts itself, competition ensues to pull these national hermaphrodites into a rigidly defined and defended nationality.

As Zahra’s research indicates, an active front in this struggle was children, who were seen as malleable targets for conversion. A common practice that predated the First Republic but persisted well into the 1930s underscores both Zahra’s concept of national indifference and King’s insistence on the primacy of corporative solidarity. German families would send their children to Czech families and vice versa, in a type of domestic “foreign” exchange, to learn the language and practices of the other major ethnic group. As Zahra documents, nationalist groups loathed the practice, complaining loudly that even socially and politically notable families took part in what they considered an heretical practice (2011, 2). In an epistolary memoir, the Czech writer Bohumil Hrabal alludes to his own participation in this practice during the First Republic, assuming that his reader would be

shocked to learn—given subsequent conflicts—that such intermingling had ever occurred. He describes the practice nostalgically, allowing that "those Germans of ours in the border area were quite okay, it was the custom to go and spend a bit of time there" and adding that "I was there to learn German" (1998, 86). Numerous other anecdotal accounts attest to the common and accepted nature of this practice. As we shall see, the expulsion of the German population in the wake of the Second World War puts an end not only to this practice but also marks the ultimate triumph for nationalists who sought to reduce nationality to fixed and unambiguous categories.

Czechoslovak as Nationality

An important topic in a discussion of Czech and German nationality in the context of the First Republic is the brief window where Czechoslovak emerged as a nationality. From our vantage point in this century, the mere word sounds like an anachronism. With the Czech and Slovak Republics becoming successful independent nations a generation ago, it is now clear to the world what has always been obvious to Czechs and Slovaks, namely, that there is no such thing as a "Czechoslovak" identity, given the unique languages and distinct histories of the two groups.

The Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia and the establishment of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia and the quasi-independent First Slovak Republic sent many politicians, intellectuals, Jews, antifascists, and others into exile in various nations around the globe. Although it was not unheard of in the First Republic to suggest that there was such a thing as a Czechoslovak identity, during this exile period it became more common. The exiles shared common traits—e.g., leftist politics and having been a target of Nazi persecution—that now seemed more important than their differences even if they spoke different languages. The defeat of Nazism and the reestablishment of the Czechoslovak Republic was also a unifying cause. A collective nostalgia for the relatively democratic First Republic contributed further to a common sense of purpose. Books such as *Stimmen aus Böhmen* (an anthology of works by Germans and Czechs)*, Zur Geschichte der tschechoslowakischen Arbeiterbewegung,* and *Briefe über deutsche und slawische Literatur,* etc., all published by the exile publisher Verlag der Einheit in London, illustrate how many exiles sought not only to uphold but also advance a common culture and preserve the vision of a democratic state consisting of multiple nationalities. By the time many of these works

appeared in print, the London-based Czechoslovak government-in-exile under Beneš was both publicly and privately weighing the expulsion of the German population, although in the earlier war years Beneš and others still proposed less drastic solutions. Their position shifted toward progressively extreme measures as Nazi conduct and atrocities came to light.

Relinquishing this Czechoslovak identity would have perhaps forced these German-speaking individuals to acknowledge another nationality, since as Zahra and others point out, national indifference was not an acceptable position in the wake of the war. Assuming a German identity would have been painful for most, while it was equally impossible for them to assimilate and become Czechs given the prominence of their cultural contributions in the German language. Those who were Jews were both typically anti- or at least non-Zionists, as well as secular; moreover, they would have surely perceived and sought to avoid the persistent anti-Semitism in Czechoslovak politics and society, if not in the early post-war years then certainly after the 1952 Slánský trial and subsequent execution of nearly every prominent Jew in the Communist Party's leadership. This last tie, Communist Party membership, held most of this group together. Nevertheless, although Communism espouses an ostensibly internationalist doctrine, it does not generally supplant nationality. Given this complex interplay of choices, the persistence of Czechoslovak becomes more understandable; it is a convenient and unambiguous shorthand for declaring allegiance to a specific geographic origin—many wrote passionately of their love for Bohemia—while at the same time distancing themselves both from the shadows of Reich German culture and the artificially conceived and now permanently tainted Sudetendeutsch identity.

We find evidence of this persistence in titles such as *Die Tschechoslowakei erzählt*, an anthology of prose and verse by contemporary Czechoslovak writers writing in Czech or German, published in 1953 in Berlin with an introduction by Louis Fürnberg. Such a volume illustrates the line of demarcation that the editors drew between "Czechoslovak" writers and German literature, aligning German-speaking "Tschechoslowake" writers more closely with the reconstituted Republic and Czech writers than with German culture. Similarly, the author of an article in AuF in 1953 lauding F.C. Weiskopf's 5,000 DM gift to the GDR refers to him as "der bekannte tschechoslowakische Schriftsteller."[7] Fürnberg also commonly referred to himself and others in his circle as Czechoslovaks. A letter he wrote at the time of

[7] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 13 February 1953. 7

the Allied victory offers a particularly clear example. Here he declares, "unser Präsident, unsere Regierung sind in Prag! … Wir sind wieder Tschechoslowaken" (1986, 1:305). Later in the same letter, he distances himself and those he considers Czechoslovak peers from Sudeten Germans who had not fled Nazi persecution:

> Unsere Deutschen daheim scheinen sich mehr als verbrecherisch zu benehmen. Wir haben eine doppelt schwere Aufgabe vor uns. Wir müssen beitragen, das Leid gutzumachen, das die Sudetendeutschen dem tschechischen und slowakischen Volke zugefügt haben. Deshalb doppelt Würde bei uns. (Ibid., 1: 306)

This distancing clarifies how for individuals from these intellectual circles, such as Fürnberg, a significant wedge had been driven between them and a German identity by the brutality of the Nazi regime. Even prior to the war, most intellectuals rejected the designation Sudetendeutsch as it situated them uncomfortably close to the larger German identity defined and dominated by Germany. Before the war, Fürnberg had in fact been one of the few German intellectuals who did not object to being referred to as Sudeten German. In a 1937 letter to a Czech theatre director, he defends "die Sudetendeutsche Dichtung"—of which he considers himself a representative—as part of his request for a theatre event showcasing Sudeten German writers who were not caught up in the prevailing mood. He wishes to demonstrate "daß die sudetendeutsche Dichtung keine faschistische, keine Blubo-Dichtung ist" [Blubo = Blut-und-Boden-Dichtung] (Ibid., 1: 52). In a letter to Reimann from 1943—that is, well into the war—he still speaks of defending Sudeten German antifascists by suggesting the publication of a Sudeten German literary anthology. As the 1945 letter above demonstrates, by that time the term Sudeten German had become taboo for Fürnberg, replaced by "Tschechslowake." As late as 1951, in a letter to Weiskopf, he was still drawing that line of distinction between Czechoslovak writers—i.e., Germans from Czechoslovakia writing in German—and German literature. He lauds Weiskopf's new book, praising it not only because he finds it a great book, but also because "es ein unsriges ist," noting melancholically in a conclusion written the following day, Weiskopf's book "steht … ganz allein da … Aus vielen Gründen" (Ibid., 1: 535). In his later letters, perhaps sobered by the harshness of the Slánský verdicts—as a prominent Jewish Communist, he surely experienced great fear—he abandoned these notions, slowly mentally and then physically distancing himself from Czechoslovakia by emigrating to the GDR. In an early 1954 letter he complains to Weiskopf that since the latter had emigrated to the GDR (in 1953), all of "die

hiesigen deutschen Nachwuchsschriftsteller" come to him for help with their writing and to find publishers, adding a sad assessment: "kurz lauter Bernhardiner, die inzwischen Dackel geworden sind und die niemand drucken und, was schlimmer ist, nähren will" (Ibid., 1: 691). Fürnberg's later letters, written after his emigration to the GDR in late 1954, convey a sense of resignation and shattered dreams. Although he had been the most vocal proponent of what one could call Czechslovakianism, he now urged his former friends and colleagues to do it "wie Weiskopf und ich" and emigrate, characterizing his decision to return to Czechoslovakia in 1945 as a grave mistake (Ibid., 2: 84). The departure of Fürnberg and Weiskopf—compounded by their respective deaths shortly after emigrating—critically weakened what was already a small and tenuous group of intellectuals who could have potentially assumed roles as cultural leaders for the Verbliebene. Their departure also marked the end of "Czechoslovak" as a nationality.

Expulsion

Beneš and the Beneš Decrees

Prior to the Munich Agreement in 1938, the Czechoslovak government led by Edvard Beneš, under enormous pressure from Nazi Germany to solve what had become an increasingly hostile conflict between Henlein's SdP and the First Republic, proposed a potential solution. That offer would have seen Czechoslovakia cede three regions to Germany and resettle with compensation about one million Sudeten Germans, with approximately 1.2 million Germans—mostly Social Democrats, Socialists, and Jews—remaining in the Czechoslovak state. Even after Munich, which the Czechs viewed as an unmitigated disaster, the London government-in-exile continued to view mass resettlement with compensation as a potential resolution to the entrenched Czech-German conflict. As the war progressed and German brutality and Sudeten German complicity in these acts came to light—in particular savage measures such as the liquidation of the residents of the villages Lidice and Ležáky in retaliation for the assassination of Reinhard Heydrich—any such plans for compromise evaporated, with expulsion becoming a viable and preferred option.

By 1942, Beneš was publicly laying the groundwork for the mass transfer of Germans from Czechoslovak lands, proposing a vision of a post-war Europe where German "Fifth Columns" no longer existed in Central European nations (Beneš 1941 and 1942). In subsequent years, his government—officially recognized by the major powers—engaged

diplomatic channels to secure Allied support for a post-war expulsion. Responses varied, but given the prevailing mood no nation much concerned itself with the rights or wellbeing of fringe German populations, creating a situation where the Czechs could proceed more or less unhindered.

In post-expulsion narratives from the Vertriebene side, Beneš is viewed at best as the enabler of atrocities against the German minority; for others, he committed crimes against humanity and embodies the Czech counterpart to Hitler (Hilf 1964, 396). All parties tend to attribute the expulsions to the so-called Beneš decrees, a series of directives developed between 1940 and 1945 by Beneš and the exile government, 143 in total. [8] The reconstituted Czechoslovak National Assembly ultimately made the decrees law in late 1945. Of the 143 decrees, only ten specifically mention Germans. Only six directly relate to the expulsion, but were critical both for shaping and justifying its course and outcome. Specifically, these were, briefly summarized:

- 5/1945 – 19 May 1945 – Declared all transfers of wealth after 29 September 1938 invalid and also stipulated the nationalization of industrial or commercial property belonging to traitors, collaborators, and those declaring German or Hungarian nationality in any census after 1929.
- 16/1945 – 19 June 1945 – Mandated prison terms or execution, if warranted, for association with fascist organizations, as well as for traitors and informants who assisted these organizations. Membership sufficed to warrant punishment for organizations associated directly with atrocities, e.g., the SS, while for others this applied only to officials and leaders, such as the SdP or the NSDAP.
- 12/1945 – 21 June 1945 – Stipulated the confiscation of all agricultural property from Germans, Hungarians, as well as traitors.
- 28/1945 – 20 July 1945 – Decreed that confiscated agricultural land could only be resettled by loyal Czechs, Slovaks, or other Slavs.
- 33/1945 – 2 August 1945 – Revoked Czechoslovak citizenship from Germans and Hungarians. It did not apply to Germans or Hungarians who had, in the time of

[8] While scholarship on the Beneš decrees is copious, for this section I am particularly indebted to Beppo Beyerl's cogent analysis of their context and application.

increased threat to the Republic, repeatedly declared themselves Czechs or Slovaks on the census.

- 71/1945 – 19 September 1945 – Mandated compulsory work to repair war damage for those who had lost citizenship per decree 33. Applied to men between fourteen and sixty and women between fifteen and fifty. Those compelled to work were to receive remuneration.

As one can see, none of these called for expulsion directly, but by revoking both property rights and citizenship from all of its German citizens on the basis of German collective guilt, the Beneš government established unambiguously the legal foundation for German collective punishment. Moreover, while the decrees lack specifically enabling language, expulsion had been discussed increasingly openly as the war progressed. After the exiled government's return in 1945, Beneš himself, while speaking in Brno / Brünn used the Czech verb *vzlíkvídovat* to describe what should be done about the German problem. This translates as "liquidate" in English; German better captures it as "hinausliquidieren." While one can debate the semantic connotations of the word—i.e., whether he meant generally that the problem must be liquidated or solved or more specifically that expulsion was the solution—in the same speech he unequivocally stated that the Germans had behaved atrociously during the war and merited severe collective punishment. The speech demarcated a turning point in the Czech posture toward Germans, as various commentators have noted (e.g., Beyerl 2002, 68; Glassheim 2016, 50).

While not part of the decrees, on 8 May 1946, the Czechoslovak National Assembly passed law 114/1946 which declared that any criminal acts committed for the purpose of regaining Czech and Slovak liberty would not be punished. In plain text, it was amnesty for anyone who had engaged in criminal actions during any phase of the expulsion, even if those acts would normally have been considered illegal. This law both legitimized past actions and created a legal basis for state-sanctioned cruelty toward both expellees and Germans who remained behind.

The Beneš decrees have continued to serve as a focal point for criticism both of Czech policy at the time and the continued Czech insistence on the validity of the decrees. Many of those directed at the German population were never annulled or revoked and remain a flashpoint for conflicts between the two governments. Those arguments aside, which are more relevant for the Vertriebene than the Verbliebene, the question remains whether the

decrees specifically and government policy and statements more generally instigated the expulsion or whether these were simply official post facto expressions of the mood of the day. That formulation assumes a logical and set order of causes and actions, but the reality is likely more complicated. A vast majority of Czechs had felt humiliated by the German occupation and/or suffered direct consequences as a result of it; the collective urge for retribution was present whether one was a government official or a common citizen. Confiscation and expulsion had begun before the government's promulgation of many of the decrees; they merely provided a legal framework to legitimize what was happening in many communities. Czech propaganda contributed to this environment, characterizing the Czechoslovak Germans as colonists and the expulsion as the correction of a mistake made by the Přemyslid kings nearly a millennium earlier; others framed it as retribution for the humiliation of the White Mountain, over three hundred years earlier. The major Czech newspaper *Rudé právo* declared in June 1945, "we can today make the proud claim that finally, all these years after the White Mountain disaster, the cleansing process will be brought to a conclusion once and for all" (cited in Glassheim 2005, 191). Public sentiment strongly favoured complete expulsion.

Expulsion Years

To understand the Verbliebene community it is essential to grasp the details of the expulsion. These details make clear who remained and under what circumstances. Disentangling the various threads presents a challenge as it was a chaotic time dominated more by spontaneous outbursts than considered and planned actions. As Wiedemann underscores, it is also critical to understand that many events often described sequentially were actually occurring simultaneously, clouding our ability to identify points of connection and obscuring important details. Within a very short period of time, Soviet and American occupiers arrived and most Germans were expelled and some permitted to stay but under harsh conditions; meanwhile, new settlers arrived to claim newly vacant villages, homes, and farms, in some cases before the previous occupants had even been finally expelled or removed (2007, 415).

Before the end of the war, many Germans, primarily Reich Germans who had relocated to the Sudetengau or the Protectorate as well as Sudeten Germans who had taken active roles in Nazi organizations, fled the Czech lands for the Reich, fearing retribution from the

liberating American and Soviet armies. As noted earlier, Czech government-in-exile propaganda had prepared the Czech people to expel the Germans; accordingly, even before the final German surrender on 8 May 1945, Czechs began to expel Germans in what most call the "wild" phase of expulsion (die wilde Vertreibung). The number expelled during this phase is a matter of some contention. Some journalistic accounts cite a figure as high as 800,000 (Beyerl 2002, 88), while more scholarly work places the figure between 300,000 and 400,000 (Staněk 1993, 22). Scholars and journalists all agree, however, that this wild phase, which took place mainly between April and August 1945, was marked by inhumane conditions, spontaneous acts of vengeance, and atrocities. Czech propaganda fueled fears of German insurgency, contributing to the violence. When a munitions depot in Ústí nad Labem / Aussig exploded on 31 July 1945, to name one prominent example, Czech Revolutionary Guards and others, blaming the explosion on Germans, killed scores of people. As is typical for events during this period, estimates of the death toll range from 30 to 3,000, with most scholarly accounts agreeing that it was far less than 100.

Recognizing that this unregulated and violent expulsion represented a potentially disastrous fiasco for the international relations of the newly reconstituted Czechoslovak Republic, the Beneš government sought both to reestablish central control over the expulsion as well as to gain explicit consent for it from the Allied Council. At the Potsdam Conference in August 1945, the Allies did consent to the expulsion, also expressing their intent to ensure that it occurred under humane conditions. Thereafter, the expulsion became less arbitrarily violent. With the state's involvement, however, it became better organized and was thus capable of expelling far greater numbers. It is also fair to question the humanity of a mechanism that forced people from their homes on short notice with a bare minimum of possessions and no financial compensation, while exposing them to abuse, terror, rape, and theft by their Czech handlers. The Allies did little more than rubber-stamp and slightly rein in a de facto state of affairs, but this minimal engagement did not prevent a persistent popular myth from taking hold in Czech popular opinion that the Allies had in some way imposed the expulsion and were thus responsible for its excesses.[9] Staněk,

[9] The GDR also propagated this myth, since it tacitly absolved their Communist "brothers" of their guilt. The widespread acceptance of this myth is illustrated by a 1990 article in *Neue Zeit*, the newspaper of the Ost-CDU during the GDR era. The writer casually mentions that three million Germans had to leave per an "allierten Beschluß" (Grubitzsch 1990).

in his landmark work on the German minority, categorically rejects this notion, however, essentially settling the matter (1993, 7).

After consenting to the expulsion, the Allies imposed a temporary moratorium on transfers in the latter months of 1945, seeking to use this time to organize the expellees' proper reception and resettlement prior to mass arrivals to avoid destabilizing the situation in post-war Germany, which lay in ruins. The Czechs also made preparations, creating lists of those to be expelled and setting up collection and transfer centres. In January 1946, the first trains carrying expelled Germans departed Czechoslovakia bound for the American occupation zone in Germany. Throughout early and mid-1946, trains departed frequently for both the American and Soviet occupation zones, expelling in total between 1.8 and 2.3 million Germans, although here, again, numbers vary widely depending on who reports them. One of the more careful accountings stems from Staněk, who settles on a figure of 1.85 million, with the majority going to the American zone. In sum, between both the wild and organized phases of the expulsion, the Czechoslovak state expelled between 2.2 and 2.5 million Germans. As one would predict, this number ranges as high as 3 million in some accounts, but most recent scholars have adjusted these estimates downward over time.

The numbers vary for a variety of reasons. For one, no one was conducting a census in the chaotic post-war period; nor did the Czechs and Slovaks keep exacting records as they spontaneously emptied homes and villages and drove Germans out. Even the organized expulsion stretches the definition of organized; it was largely a loosely organized action primarily intended to fend off further wanton killing and was poorly documented. Adding to the confusion were other means of expulsion, both major and minor. The so-called Ullmann transports (Alois Ullmann was a social democrat from Ústi nad Labem / Aussig) provided German antifascists with a means to leave at their own discretion, enabling them to take more possessions than the other mechanism permitted as well as to name a custodian for their farms and property. Estimates put the number of individuals exercising this option at approximately 80,000. By similar means, approximately 30,000 Communist Sudeten Germans resettled in the Soviet occupation zone. There are also myriad anecdotal accounts of individuals crossing the border of their own accord. In one instance, a young woman from the village of Všeruby / Neumark simply received a tip from a Czech policeman that her village was to be cleared out soon and so she acted upon his suggestion that she should leave on her own accord and take as much with her as possible (Gerhard Hacker, pers.

comm.). In sum, by the end of 1946, the vast majority of the German population had been expelled from or left Czechoslovakia, a small but not insignificant number of Germans remained, and as many as 30,000 had died as a result of these actions.[10]

In his book documenting the brutal acts enacted upon Germans by Czechs during the expulsion, Staněk captures the mood of the era by asserting that the Czechs had unleashed "sozial, moralisch und kulturell entwurzelte Kräfte" in the wake of the war (2003, 223). This sense of uprootedness could perhaps be explained by the notion that the Czechs were cutting into the flesh of their own nation. Germans had not lived entirely separate from Czechs, no matter how geographically concentrated. From a different vantage point, Zahra characterizes the expulsion as the ultimate victory in a fifty-year war, i.e., a victory for nationalists over national indifference (2011, 258). She concludes that "ethnic cleansing was not just a radical solution to national conflict in Europe; it was a final solution to the persistent problem of national hermaphroditism and ambivalence" (Ibid., 264). While it is hard to disagree with her conclusion, she skirts a thorny issue: ethnic cleansing is never complete. Germans remained in Czechoslovakia, no matter how fragmented their communities.

Life After the Expulsions

Counting the Community

Scholars disagree on how many Germans remained post-expulsion and the reasons why they remained. Various accounts place the number of Germans remaining at the end of 1946 between 200,000 and 300,000, with Staněk's figure of 215,000 representing one of the more credible tallies. Staněk notes, however, that even this figure fails to capture the true picture, as it does not include approximately 10,000 German wives of Czech men (1993, 22). The figures provided by scholars are in turn based upon estimates provided by various Czech ministries and politicians, which were based on rough surveys and censuses conducted in turbulent and chaotic times. Ultimately, however, it does seem reasonable to assume that at the end of the expulsion there were between 200,000 and 250,000 Verbliebene Germans, or well less than 10% of the pre-war community.

[10] The Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft routinely employs a figure nearly ten times greater; the figure given here represents the result of research conducted by the joint Czech-German historical commission.

While the expulsion officially concluded by the end of November 1946 when the organized transports ceased, a period of what one could characterize as self-expulsion ensued, i.e., Germans opting to leave the country to reunite with family or for other reasons. From 1947 until the early 1950s, each year saw at least a few thousand Germans leave Czechoslovakia through legal means, although many assume that others simply chose to leave by crossing the border without legal consent. The Czech government had plans to continue the expulsions, as their original goal had been complete expulsion, but the Allies, in particular the Americans, resisted and ultimately thwarted these measures over concerns that it placed too much pressure on a fragile German society. By the late 1940s and early 1950s, most estimates place the Verbliebene community between 160,000 and 180,000, demonstrating the continued emigration/self-expulsion.

A fairly common practice in German scholarship of the 1950s and 1960s involved offering detailed breakdowns of the German population at the municipal or district level. Presumably, the point behind this detailed counting was to demonstrate that despite the overwhelming reduction in overall numbers, at the local level some communities retained a fairly significant German population. These assertions implicitly countered prevailing rhetoric that considered the German community too scattered to merit the establishment of German-language schools, for example. While scholars were able to demonstrate that some communities may have had significant German population well into the 1960s—e.g., Sokolov / Falkenau with 25.3% in 1961 (Bohmann 1968, 346)—these numbers failed to address the demographic nature of this community. As one moves further from the expulsion, the German population grows increasingly old as the lack of schools and other necessary support inhibited their ability to foster a new generation. Moreover, the towns and villages with significant German elements were often small and relatively rural. As Verbliebene numbers continued to decline overall, the practice of tabulating the German population at the local level ceased.

Responses to nearly every estimate of the overall size of the community consistently object that the figure does not reflect its actual size, the implication being that it is much larger. This notion of underrepresentation has accompanied every post-war census or estimate and stems from both some Sudeten Germans in Germany as well as from the Verbliebene themselves. I would suggest that it likely has very little to do with undercounting and far more to do with the fluid and vague nature of nationality and how

individuals perceive nationality. As I noted above, Zahra would call this national indifference, i.e., the individuals are more concerned with their daily lives than they are with broad notions of nationality. The Verbliebene, in particular, who felt that the official count was too low were reacting, I propose, based on a perceived community, failing to recognize that many individuals they may have viewed as German may well have elected to identify publicly as Czech for myriad viable reasons. Those who complained of undercounting could perhaps not accept that individuals who followed this course had no particularly strong feelings about the choice, and simply, as Zahra suggests, picked the side with the better benefits.

Ultimately, no political change—not 1953, 1960, 1968, 1989—ever made a real difference in the trend line of people who declared German nationality. At each of those moments the assumption prevailed that, given the relaxation of restrictions that came with the shift, Germans would finally openly declare their ethnicity. A Czech student at the Charles University in Prague reveals the prevalence of this assumption in post-revolution Czech society in her thesis on post-Velvet Revolution German organizations when she states that she had expected the German count to rise after 1989, implying that Communist oppression had made Germans uncomfortable, rather than this being a general Czech issue (Petrnoušková 2012, 17).[11] For the Verbliebene, persistently claiming that the community is larger is perhaps merely an understandable human reaction to watching one's community disintegrate through assimilation, emigration, death, and indifference.

Reasons Germans Remained

Germans remaining in Czechoslovakia post-expulsion generally fall into one or more of three broad categories: those with specialized skills or jobs, those related to Czechs through intermarriage, and/or those with antifascist credentials. While some scholars, perhaps revealing bias related to specific Czech or Sudeten German points of view, emphasize one or two of these factors, both of the monographic treatments of the Verbliebene describe all three accurately, even though the respective authors represent widely divergent viewpoints

[11] In a narrow sense, her assumption may be correct, i.e.- no longer fearing oppression, some individuals do declare German ethnicity openly who may not have done so earlier. 2001 census data shows that of the 39,106 individuals who declared German ethnicity, 10,836 declared Czech as their mother tongue (Neustupný and Nekvapil 2005, 18). This does not alter the downward trend in the German population's numbers, showing that even if people feel enabled to declare their heritage, assimilation and time are inexorably eliminating the German element from Czech society.

(Urban 1964, 13-14; Staněk 1993, 22-23). Given his access to archival materials to which Urban, as a West German in the early 1960s, would have had no access, Staněk's accounting of the demographic details of the Verbliebene at the end of 1946 is both the most exacting and the most credible. At the end of 1946, the Verbliebene community consisted of:

- 32,537 specialists (with 53,103 family members)
- 12,985 individuals who had provisional certificates of citizenship (presumably by documenting their loyalty to Czechoslovakia during the occupation)
- 33,057 in mixed marriages (not counting the aforementioned 10,000 German wives of Czech men; presumably this number means men)
- 1,876 German Jews, 4,351 excluded for reasons of age or health
- 6,500 with deferred expulsion orders, and
- 18,000 anti-fascists awaiting emigration (Staněk 1993, 23).

Quick arithmetic shows that these numbers do not add up to the 215,000 that Staněk suggested as a total figure at the end of 1946. These results underscore the challenge and perhaps futility of attempting to pin a firm and immutable nationality on individuals.

Despite the challenges of arriving at exact figures, no serious scholar or writer disputes the continued existence of a Verbliebene community, although as noted, scholars frequently dismiss it as an inconvenient marginal issue. Counting aside, there is ample evidence of a relatively large, yet scattered minority in a small country facing a difficult future. The Verbliebene existed in a lawless environment throughout the late 1940s and early 1950s, having been stripped of their property and their citizenship. Moreover, violent crimes committed against them during the expulsion years were summarily pardoned by the National Assembly.

Given the random and chaotic nature of the expulsion, there was often no logic behind the expulsion of specific individuals. Myriad individuals who fell into one or more of the aforementioned exclusion categories experienced expulsion. Those three categories are descriptive of those who remained, but did not necessarily constitute a prescriptive logic for historical actions; blind rage seems to have driven many. Individuals in all three categories who were not expelled had in common that they tended to come from the working class, whereas both the wild and planned phases of expulsion targeted intellectuals and educated persons, with consequences for cultural activity as documented in the following chapter.

Additionally, the Verbliebene had lost their socially prominent nobility, who had largely controlled the German economic sphere (Glassheim 2005, 229).

Discrimination

As noted earlier, the expulsion occurred simultaneously with other massive upheavals and shifts in Czechoslovakia. Before the Czech government organized the official resettlement of lands and property vacated by Germans, many non-German Czechoslovak citizens sensed an opportunity to improve their financial or social status by moving into these regions to assume ownership of abandoned property. Scholars writing from all vantage points refer to these early opportunists disparagingly as "Goldgräber" and agree that their presence contributed to the chaos and violence of the expulsions. Germans had no legal basis to resist them. Many of these Goldgräber subsequently left with their booty, leaving the borderlands and returning to their former homes in the Czechoslovak interior. Even after the government organized resettlement more consistently, the legacy occupants of the borderlands—both Czechs and Germans—were generally moved aside in favour of the new settlers, who quickly assumed most positions of authority. While the Czechs who had lived in those areas prior to occupation were more familiar with Germans and hence more likely to sympathize and assist those whom they knew as neighbours, acquaintances, or colleagues, the new settlers had no such allegiances and in fact exploited such pro-German sentiments to establish their dominant position over the old guard, whom they viewed as tainted by close contact with Germans (Wiedemann 2007, 289-295). This situation created a more hostile atmosphere for Germans, cutting off their access to socially negotiated means of redress in addition to their existing lack of access to judicial redress due to their legal status as non-persons.

Even Germans not targeted for expulsion were often arbitrarily relocated, interred, and/or assigned to work details. To reiterate, as non-persons they had no legal means to resist this treatment. The Czechoslovak government forced between approximately 15,000 and 20,000 Verbliebene to resettle for work assignments in the Czech interior where there was no indigenous German minority, further fragmenting and diluting communities (Ibid., 420).

Less organized forms of discrimination abounded, as well. In a letter to the editor of AuF, Jan Grünhut expresses outrage that his newspaper had been returned to sender with

the note "German not read here."[12] Such small slights were common occurrences given the prevailing anti-German mood of the post-war years. More organized forms of discrimination stemmed from official sources. The Czech government banned German schools and associations, imposed the wearing of white armbands by Germans when in public, and mandated Slavicization of place and personal names. Germans were not even allowed to own radios until 1950 and had no access to any other media (Wiedemann 2010, 63). The intent behind these measures—whether private or public—was clear. Wiedemann cites the pronouncement of a Czech official in 1947: "Wenn wir diese Grenzen auslöschen [the border between the German lands and the interior], so löschen wir auch das Protektorat und die Sudeten aus" (Ibid., 58).

Another aspect of discrimination affected Jews who either identified as Germans or had German identity thrust upon them by others. In a perverse irony, some surviving Jews who had opted to identify as Germans on the 1930 census, then been declared Jews by the Nazi Nürnberg laws and victimized by Nazi persecution, returned to Czechoslovakia only to be branded as Germans by the Czechs and thus subjected to anti-German measures and discrimination. Jews in Ústí nad Labem / Aussig, for example, were even forced to wear the white German armband, drawing immediate condemnation from the Jewish community (Wiedemann 2007, 307). Zahra asserts that Czechs generally associated Jews with Germandom and Germanization and were persistently anti-Semitic (2011, 257). This endemic anti-Semitism culminated, abetted by widespread late-Stalinist anti-Semitism in Soviet satellites, in the Slánský trial in 1952 that led to the execution of numerous prominent Jewish Communists, including Slánský. The impact of this anti-Semitism and the Slánský trial extended into the Verbliebene community. Weiskopf and Fürnberg, its two most prominent intellectuals—who had impeccable antifascist and Communist credentials and had even served in Czechoslovak government positions after 1946—emigrated to the GDR mainly out of fear of becoming a target of a purge, while others went to prison, including Lenka Reinerová and Oskar Kosta. Writers such as these last two disappeared from the newspaper for long intervals in the 1950s, when political conditions dictated; Reinerová and her husband, Theodor Balk, were also exiled to Pardubice, presumably to lessen their influence or perhaps induce them to emigrate. Although in the early 1960s, the government

[12] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 13 March 1952. 10

rehabilitated both of them, as well as prominent Germanist Eduard Goldstücker, in the wake of 1968 all were again considered personae non gratae.

All members of Czechoslovakia's German community faced intense ethnic hostility and discrimination at the end of the war. A key difference between the resulting Vertriebene and Verbliebene communities is that, for the latter, this state of affairs persisted for decades, only softening in recent decades as generations pass away. The occupation and war had seen Germans commit myriad acts of staggering brutality; for Czechoslovakia and its people, this suffering was compounded by the trauma and humiliation of Munich, which established that foreign powers would not come to Czechoslovakia's aid when the country was threatened by Germany. It is also critical to recall that in the post-war years, hundreds of thousands of new settlers from the interior arrived in the now partially vacant borderlands, with government support and encouragement. The Verbliebene not only had to contend with personal animosity and discrimination, but also were surrounded by an environment that not only sought actively to obliterate their German culture, but also to impose forcefully a new Czech identity in these formerly German regions, supported by new schools, exhibits, movie theaters, and other entities. The Czechization process impacted every aspect of the lives of the Verbliebene.

Perhaps most critically, the Verbliebene were systematically deprived of the means to rebuild a cultural sphere that could sustain and connect their community. As Neumann observed early on, wherever Germans remained, they were no longer a "fundierte Volksgruppe," but rather "vielfach zerstreut und entwurzelt" and incapable of forming strong communities, and not permitted to do so, either (1952, 432). Although in subsequent years some rights were restored to the Verbliebene, they were never sufficient to enable the reformation of a cohesive community.

Communist Easing of Anti-German Measures

Given the generally dismal record of Stalinism, which the aforementioned Czech anti-Semitic tendencies only exacerbated, it can appear somewhat surprising that in the early 1950s, parallel to the worst Stalinist excesses in Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party took steps to stabilize the status of the German minority. One should question, however, whether these actions stemmed from a sincere application of Communism's inherent internationalist stance, which sets aside nationality in favour of unified class struggle, or

from pragmatic political calculation. There are certainly indications that the latter played a significant role in this shift.

The shift in tone from the Party is often traced to President Klement Gottwald's quip "Není Němec jako Němec" (loosely: no German is like the other). When he first formulated this statement is unclear, but at a meeting of the Central Committee on 24 February 1950 it became doctrine for the party, signalling a shift in policy. Continued anti-German oppression and the lack of solid legal footing for the Verbliebene had, as noted, become incompatible in general with proletarian internationalism but more specifically were at odds with the need for Czechoslovakia to forge "brotherly" Communist bonds to the neighbouring German Communist state, founded in 1949. The party formally abandoned plans to expel more Germans, declaring as well the borderland resettlement initiatives (i.e., the mechanisms to introduce Czech and other new settlers into formerly German areas) completed, dissolving the administrative bodies responsible for these activities in early 1950; both actions contributed to stabilizing communities. There is also a general assumption on the part of many observers that this relaxation acknowledged economic realities, in particular the contributions of German workers to key industries, such as coal mining, as well as a general need for skilled labour to support Communist industrialization plans.

Although the party had opened a path to citizenship for Germans several years earlier, not all Germans had opted to seek Czechoslovak citizenship, leading the party to grant citizenship to all by decree on 24 May 1953. The Communists also relaxed restrictions on German media, leading to the establishment of the newspaper *Aufbau und Frieden* in 1951, which I discuss in detail in the following chapter. Radio broadcasts in German began in 1957, but only fifteen minutes at 4:00 pm, a time at which many were still at work. While by virtue of the citizenship law the Germans had as of 1953 full legal rights as individuals, they still lacked rights as a minority and a nationality, e.g., they still faced restrictions on the establishment of cultural organizations as well as public gatherings. An exception to the latter were "Mitarbeiter und Leser" meetings organized by AuF in 1952 and 1953 (Brügel 1957, 555). These restrictions did not apply to other national minorities, e.g., Poles, Ukrainians, and Hungarians.

Another key restriction the Vertriebene faced was limited access to West German media and a near complete lack of official cultural contacts with the FRG. All Czechoslovak citizens had limited access to West German media, but for those who did not speak German

this lack was of little consequence. Cultural contact between the East and West during the Cold War was, of course, generally restricted, but the Verbliebene had to contend with the additional complication of two German states. The GDR jealously guarded its position as the bridge to German culture for Czechoslovakia, which applied to the Verbliebene community as well despite the fact that the majority of the expellees had resettled in the FRG (Härtel 1981b, 442; V. Zimmermann 2010).

Another change set in motion by the granting of citizenship in 1953 was the prospect of political representation, albeit within the structures of a Communist state that lacked democratic elections. The 1954 election saw three Germans elected to the National Assembly, Josef Pötzl (violin maker; Kraslice / Graslitz), Rudolf Müller (glassmaker; Jablonec / Gablonz), and Johann Jungbauer (Teplice / Teplitz), who was ostensibly an independent, not a Communist (Reindl-Mommsen 1967, 319). Pötzl later contributed literary pieces to the newspaper.

Wandertheater and Other Cultural Activities

Throughout the entire Communist period, the loudest and most consistent Vertriebene complaints about their status revolved around two issues. The first was the lack of German-language instruction in schools. The community intuitively recognized that without these schools, the future of their community was at risk as their children would be educated in a Czech-speaking environment. The desire for schools was never met. The other complaint was the general lack of cultural opportunities and media, such as publishing outlets, German-language literature and books from within the community, theatres, and motion pictures. In the wake of the 1953 decision to grant citizenship, the Czechoslovak government relaxed some of the restrictions on cultural activities and associations for Germans.

One particularly outstanding example of entities that emerged from this shift in policy was the German Wandertheater, established in 1954, fulfilling a promise that Minister of Culture Václav Kopecký[13] had made at the tenth Communist Party congress in June (Borchardt 1955). AuF announced this new group on 10 August 1954, putting out a call for actors and stagehands. Later that year, the newspaper printed overwhelmingly positive

[13] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 10 August 1954. 6

reviews of the Wandertheater's first production, a staging of Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe*.[14] The community reaction was equally positive and effusive. The Wandertheater's official name was Staatliches Wandertheater Prag - Deutsches Ensemble, but the newspaper and community members generally referred to it by the shorthand Schiller-Theater.[15] By 1956, articles about the activities and productions of the Schiller-Theater became a weekly occurrence in the newspaper. Providing evidence of the desire for a richer and more active cultural life, the tone of the articles shifted from mere reviews or expressions of appreciation to more general discussions of theatre as a form, such as "Schauspieler für Stücke oder Stücke für Schauspieler" in 1956.[16] The third anniversary of the theatre in 1957 merited three articles, all by individuals who were active themselves as literary writers in the community.[17] A particularly promising development in terms of cultivating and developing a domestic theatre community was the shift from presenting either classical German dramas (Kleist, Schiller, et al.) or Brecht's plays toward productions of plays by a domestic author, Franz Pálka, who also acted in the ensemble. He wrote two plays, *Schneesturm* in 1956 and *Die große Stunde der Anne Gerber* in 1960. It is not certain that the Schiller-Theater staged the latter, but the former found an appreciative audience when it toured in late 1956 and 1957.[18] Many letter writers expressed great satisfaction that the theatre was staging work by a member of their community.

Although positive reviews continued to appear in the paper for many productions, two 1958 letters directed at Pálka, who had assumed a leading role in the group's operation, expressed the audience's desire to see less "political" material on the stage and more of "das Edle und Schöne."[19] Given the role of the newspaper as a vehicle for government propaganda, its publication of any critical letters at all could perhaps indicate more widespread disappointment with the theatre. Although I could locate no documentation of

---

[14] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 2 November 1954. 1-2

[15] While the newspaper never commented on nor explained this name, it was perhaps a curious choice for a theatre in a nation suspicious of its German minority and of German culture more generally. Schiller has been interpreted in myriad ways by literary scholars, but the association of Schiller with fundamental political issues—e.g., the moniker Freiheitsdichter—in German culture is common to many schools of thought.

[16] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 26 October 1956. 7

[17] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 1 November 1957. 6

[18] A comprehensive Czech theatre database—Visual Study (http://vis.idu.cz/)--confirms the production of *Schneesturm* but has no data related to *Anna Gerber*. Based on the data found in Visual Study, the archives of its producer, the Arts and Theatre Institute (Umění-Divadelní ústav), would seem to offer a potentially rich resource to any researcher wishing to explore German theatre productions of this period.

[19] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 19 July 1958. 5

the political discussions around the theatre's founding and operation, as a state-subsidized organization, they likely had little flexibility when it came to choosing pieces to stage. The last production receiving notice in the newspaper was *Dreimal klingeln* by Hans-Dieter Schmidt, a contemporary GDR comedy about housing shortages, which would seem to represent the type of politically inclined piece to which the community objected.[20] While it is unclear why the theatre, which had been so popular during the late 1950s and into the 1960s, ceased activity in 1961, the audience's dissatisfaction may have figured its demise. It disappeared from the newspaper and cultural life without any official comment.[21]

Other scholars have mentioned the existence of other cultural groups in this same period, one suggesting that as many as thirty-five such groups existed in 1959 (Reindl-Mommsen 1967, 320). Another documents the existence of the Brünner Kulturgruppe led by film actress Liesl Andergast, who lived in Vienna but offered her services to the regime (Reinisch 1957, 74). Unlike the newspaper had done with the Wandertheater, there was no active reporting on the activities of these groups. If documentary evidence of their existence remains—a dubious prospect—it is likely in private ownership.

1960 and 1968 and the Nationality Question

In 1960, Czechoslovakia adopted a new constitution that brought both changes and disappointment for the Verbliebene. Among the positive outcomes was the removal of language from the 1948 constitution's preamble that implicitly established German collective guilt and justified expulsion, but this was merely a symbolic gesture at this stage. Of greater concern for the Verbliebene was the lack of any provisions granting them status as a recognized nationality, which would have theoretically provided a basis upon which they could successfully lobby for German-language schools. The 1960 constitution explicitly named the Hungarian, Ukrainian, and Polish minorities and granted them the right to education in their native languages, increasing Verbliebene frustration. That German demands for similar rights were a point of discussion at the highest level of government becomes clear from a public statement by President Antonín Novotný:

---

[20] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 20 May 1961. 6

[21] An article in the *Berliner Zeitung* alluded vaguely to the fact that in the wake of the 1960 constitutional revisions that had declared the German "issue" permanently solved, a number of German cultural groups had had to disband because their work was not "auf 'dem erforderlichen sozialistischen Niveau'" (Schmidt 1992). No source for the quote was given and it remains unclear if this applied to the Schiller-Theater.

> Was die Frage der früheren deutschen Minderheit betrifft, so wiederholen wir aufs neue, daß die Bürger deutscher Volkszugehörigkeit bei uns keine ethnische Einheit bilden. Die deutsche Frage ist für unsere Republik mit voller Zustimmung der vier Großmächte kraft des Potsdamer Übereinkommens ein für alle Mal geregelt worden. (cited in German translation by Hilf 1964, 403)

Bruno Köhler, a member of the party's Central Committee of German origin, reiterated this position at length in an article in a party journal. He argued that the government was providing sufficiently for the needs of what he considered a marginal community of aging Germans by subsidizing German-language publications, theatres, and cultural groups, while also asserting that the number of individuals who did not speak Czech and thus required such support was steadily declining. He cynically and disingenuously observed that it had become impossible to tell the children of German parents from those of Czechs or Slovaks, ignoring the fact that this was only the case due to his government's persistent denial of German demands for schools (1960, 988). For Köhler, whom some German scholars of the era sarcastically referred to as an Ehrenslawe and who publicly spoke and wrote only in Czech, full assimilation was a natural and inevitable process. There was evidently little inclination on the part of the government to make further concessions to their German minority in 1960.

The ensuing years saw the steady liberalization of political life in Czechoslovakia, culminating in 1968 with the Prague Spring and subsequent Warsaw Pact invasion. These widely reported events often overshadow a number of changes that survived the reform movement, if in somewhat different form from what had been proposed. One result was a new constitution, the preamble of which guaranteed all citizens equal rights, regardless of nationality. The constitution also established the new federative model for the nation, i.e., a federation of the Czech and Slovak Socialist Republics, leading to the establishment of respective National Councils. As in the 1950s, the Germans again had at least nominal representation on the Czech National Council, with three members: Hans Nygrin, Heribert Panster, and Rudolf Herkommer. More significantly, 1968 saw negotiations between the government and the Verbliebene community regarding the establishment of a national German cultural organization, which offered the prospect of significant progress toward more cultural and educational opportunities.

Founding of the Kulturverband

1968 was a year of great political upheaval in Czechoslovakia. Communist reformers, led by Alexander Dubček, offered the promise of "Socialism with a human face," unleashing a wave of optimism that spread through nearly every aspect of Czechoslovak society, including the Verbliebene. The community's newspaper suddenly lost its overbearing Communist viewpoint and formulaic tone, printing journalism by its own editors and reporters on pages that had been reserved for content from central government sources. Not coincidentally, circulation rose from 19,300 at the beginning of 1968 to a peak of 43,000 by the end of July, as the paper reported less than two weeks before the Warsaw Pact invasion.[22]

In an April 1968 article with a title illustrating the ambient optimism ("Auf dem Weg zu kulturellem Eigenleben"), a party functionary spoke candidly about the lack of a German cultural association even though other minorities had long had such groups. Contrary to the pessimistic view that Czechoslovakia had no viable German minority articulated by Köhler and Novotný only eight years earlier, the official pointed out that in districts such as Chomutov / Komotau the population was still nearly 50% German.[23] Within weeks of that interview, the government granted explicit permission for the formation of a sanctioned German cultural organization for the first time since 1945, news that made the front page, itself a rarity for news about the community.[24] The same edition reported on the first meeting of a local group, namely a "gründende Versammlung der Kulturvereinigung für die deutschen Bürger des Bezirkes Most."[25] Subsequent editions reported similar activity, until the August invasion wiped any such content nearly entirely from the pages of the newspaper, swiftly and decisively ending the brief window of press freedom.

Later that year, somewhat surprisingly, news of the formation of a cultural association reappeared in the newspaper, along with the founding platform statement for the national cultural association, the Kulturverband der Deutschen in der ČSSR.[26] One tenet of this platform explicitly addressed the community's desire for literature from their own numbers:

[22] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 9 August 1968. 4
[23] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 26 April 1968. 14
[24] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 17 May 1968. 1
[25] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 17 May 1968. 18
[26] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 8 November 1968. 3

> Jede Aufforderung zu schöpferischer literarischer Betätigung muß ohne Möglichkeit, literarische Arbeiten zu publizieren, ins Leere gehen. Eine Editionstätigkeit in deutscher Sprache im Rahmen des tschechoslowakischen Verlagswesens – für inländische deutsche Autoren – ist daher aktuell.[27]

Although this proclamation seemed to herald a shift in direction toward organized cultural activities, given the general political chaos in the country at the time, it was not until nearly six months later that the government officially accepted the articles of constitution for the organization. The call for support for literary activities survived this approval process intact and was an officially stated goal for the new organization.[28] In July, the newspaper introduced the members of the Kulturverband's presidium; the oldest member was fifty-six, while most were in their thirties or forties.[29]

Although it was a government sanctioned and supported cultural organization, little documentary evidence of the Kulturverband has survived, as I discovered in the course of my own research, as have others.[30] The brief window of free expression that the reform movement had opened that enabled Verbliebene to express clearly their desire for more support for cultural and literary activities lasted only a short while, before closing as the period known as Normalization settled over Czechoslovakia, throttling free cultural expression regardless of nationality. News of the Kulturverband continued to appear regularly in the newspaper, but it was an endless series of reports on meetings where declarations of the group's loyalty to the building of Socialism and to Marxist-Leninist ideology dominated the agenda. Given the prevailing oppression of this era, this turn is in no way surprising; as Pešek wryly observed, culture is a primary form of resistance against dictatorship and oppression (2010, 35). A typical article from this era reported on the 1975 meeting of the KV leadership that took place under the motto "Alle unsere Kräfte für Frieden und Sozialismus" and resulted in the regimented formulation of letters and

---

[27] Ibid.
[28] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 25 April 1969.
[29] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 18 July 1969. 3
[30] A Czech undergraduate student, Jaroslava Petrnoušková, noted in the abstract of her thesis on the activities of German organizations between 1989 and 1999 that the records of these organizations have largely been lost or destroyed. She also notes that she could locate only one scholarly work that focuses on the organizations, an ethnographic work published in Czech (J. Otčenášek: *Němci v Čechách po roce 1945*). She highlights how these organizations are maintained by the dedication of local leaders, maintaining few written records. They are (and were) primarily social clubs. She based her work on personal interviews with leaders of two such local organizations.

messages to various bodies assuring them of Kulturverband loyalty and support.[31] This was front page news.

The paucity of information related to the KV makes it difficult even to reconstruct basic organizational information. German Vertriebene scholars of the era with ties to the Verbliebene community offer occasional glimpses into the KV's activities, but these are both vague and somewhat contradictory. Hilf identifies Hans Nygrin as the founding chair, but suggests that he was replaced in fall 1970 during the widespread Normalization purges by Heribert Panster (1971, 514), who was generally regarded within the Verbliebene community, even decades later, as an orthodox and uncompromising Communist. Maier contradicts Hilf, naming Panster as the founding chair, yet suggesting that he was largely absent from its actual running, with that role assumed by Nygrin as the "geschäftsführender Vorsitzende" with support from Gerhard Hünigen as secretary (1970, 74-75). Hilf, however, writes that Hünigen was replaced by Josef Pötzl (1971, 514). These accounts highlight two points. First, regardless of who was in office, all were men and staunch old guard Communists. Secondly, these accounts demonstrate how difficult it is to ascertain even basic facts about the Verbliebene community.

Although the KV reported 7,000 members in 1970[32], the era of Normalization effectively blunted any impact its members may have desired with regard to expanding cultural and literary opportunities for the community. The 1970s and 1980s saw the Verbliebene's numbers steadily erode, with a corresponding decrease in locally generated or locally focused content appearing in the newspaper. The grinding routine that settled over the remaining Verbliebene reflected the general cultural malaise present in post-Normalization Czechoslovakia.

Politics and the Paper

The Verbliebene newspaper existed long before the Kulturverband, but after the latter's founding, the newspaper became its de facto voice. As a publication that reached deep into the Verbliebene community, it provided an optimal vehicle for communicating the activities of the Kulturverband and its many local branches to the community. Theoretically, the newspaper should also have been an effective platform for public dialogue about the

[31] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 20 June 1975. 1
[32] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 3 July 1970. 3

Kulturverband's activities and progress via the letters page. Although many letters did mention the Kulturverband, to characterize them as part of a dialogue would imply that the Kulturverband and its officers responded in some forum. The newspaper reported dutifully on dull, formulaic Kulturverband meetings—statements, loyalty declarations, elections of officers—but these reports consistently failed to address the demands put forth by letter writers: schools, German-language instruction, theatre, literature. In a word, culture.

As is the case with the Kulturverband, there are nearly no records available to researchers to document the newspaper's existence. Ingrid Pavel, who started at the PVz in 1971 and served as its last editor from 1998 until its demise in 2006, asserts that due to frequent moves and successive personnel reductions it was not possible for the newspaper to maintain an archive.[33] Given this lack of documentation, she represents a rare and critical source of information about the newspaper. Through interviews with her in 1999 and 2006, as well as through correspondence, it was possible to learn some details about the internal operation of the newspaper. Other sources of information include published interviews with individuals associated with the newspaper, as well as occasional mentions in scholarly articles or journalistic reports. Pavel also shared with me a brief, handwritten chronicle of editorial changes and events that Walter Drahotský maintained from 1970 until 1978 that she has in her personal possession. The newspaper itself represents a source, as well, as changes in editorships or policies appeared in the paper, albeit inconsistently, particularly in times of political crisis such as 1968. Sudeten German Vertriebene newspapers such as the *Sudetendeutsche Zeitung* in Germany and the *Sudetenpost* in Austria, frequently mentioned and cited AuF and PVz; the latter is particularly useful as it has been digitized and made available in its entirety online, including optical character recognition. Whether citing the Vertriebene newspaper directly or quoting it via the *Sudetenpost* and other sources, however, one must recall that AuF and the PVz appeared under the strict control of a Communist regime concerned both with throttling any hint of German revanchist tendencies as well as enforcing ideological fealty, rendering the newspaper's content far less than transparent with regard to its inner functioning and decision-making mechanisms.

[33] Pasch and Zimmermann (2013) imply that such an archive does exist, although in the context where they mention such an archive they fail to mention its whereabouts (while being very specific about other archives), so they may have simply been indicating that such an archive would be useful for their project without knowing if such existed.

The influence of the political climate also made itself felt in the choice of editors-in-chief. The founding editor in 1951 was Kurt Babel, a dedicated Communist and co-founder of the KSČ, with Fritz Schalek as his deputy.[34] Babel served as editor into the early 1960s, replaced in April 1965 by Vojmír Šimonek, a Czech journalist who had previously served as director of the Haus der Tschechoslowakischen Kultur in East Berlin.[35] Šimonek was still in this role in 1968 during the Prague Spring, using editorials to express passionately his—and implicitly the newspaper's—enthusiastic support for Dubček and the reformers. For these sentiments, as well as for criticisms directed at other socialist nations, he received a travel ban from the GDR leadership, who also banned two early 1968 PVz issues. According to various accounts, Šimonek was in Hamburg when the Warsaw Pact troops invaded Czechoslovakia and opted to remain there rather than return to his home country (Zimmermann 2011; *Neues Deutschland* 1968). It was not until 1976 that the PVz, in an edition commemorating the newspaper's twenty-fifth anniversary, confirmed—without using names—that some editors had left the country permanently, implying that these individuals had displayed reactionary tendencies.[36] Fritz Schalek, who had remained in the role of deputy editor throughout the newspaper's existence, rose to the role of editor-in-chief with Šimonek's departure.

Schalek's tenure marked a singular departure from the practice of having either a Czech or hardline Communist in the top editorial position. He had occupied a position in the Interior Ministry under the Communists, but was caught up in the early 1950s purges, ostensibly for his close connections to the West (Pasch and Zimmermann 2013, 1). The fact that he had Jewish roots through his father may also have played a role in his dismissal. It was also during his tenure that the newspaper and the nascent Kulturverband became closely, if not strictly officially, interlinked, with the paper effectively becoming the official voice of the cultural organization. Accordingly, Schalek became part of the executive committee of the Kulturverband, also ostensibly penning one of its founding policy papers

[34] In a 2013 conference paper, Pasch and Zimmermann note that Schalek's papers are held by the Collegium Bohemicum in Ústí nad Laben / Aussig, although at the time they were being evaluated and processed. The Collegium also has the papers of his father, Robert, a judge as well as an author who appears in the bibliography of literary works. Once these two collections are released to the public, per my research they will represent the only archival collections related to Verbliebene individuals available in Czech archives.

[35] In a brief note announcing Šimonek's arrival in its 21 May 1965 issue, the Austrian *Sudetenpost* states that he replaced another Czech editor-in-chief, who had died several months earlier; in Drahotský's chronicle, he states this was Jiří Pilař.

[36] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 24 September 1976. 6-9

(Ibid., 2). By 1970, however, as Normalization measures increasingly came to define Czechoslovak society, individuals who lacked hardline credentials, such as Schalek, found themselves at odds with party leadership and lost their positions. Schalek, while still deputy editor, had written a number of editorials in early 1968 openly criticizing the government's treatment of the German minority, including an accusation that the government deliberately manipulated census results to decrease the size of the German population.[37] In addition to losing his roles as editor-in-chief and member of the Kulturverband leadership, he was expelled by the Communist Party (Ibid., 2).[38]

Schalek was replaced by Josef Lenk, a loyal Communist who ostensibly, as with Babel, espoused assimilationist views (Herget 1977, 2). His deputy, Artur Ulbrich, also came to the paper with hardliner credentials. Lenk retired in 1975, with Heribert Panster assuming the role of editor-in-chief, which he held until the Velvet Revolution in 1989. Panster's arrival underscored the close relationship between the paper and the Kulturverband, virtually ensuring that the party-loyal attitude that he and other leaders imposed upon the Kulturverband would determine the content and tone of the newspaper. At this point in his career, Panster served mainly in political roles, while his education and previous career had been in forestry. Given his lack of journalistic experience, he served mainly as a figurehead at the newspaper, while Ulbrich handled daily affairs and enforced ideological constraints (Pavel, pers. comm.).

These editorial successions indicate that, other than for a brief window under Šimonek and his immediate successor Schalek, the newspaper was under the direct control of editors who adhered closely to ideologically orthodox Communist positions. Moreover, Babel, Lenk, and Panster, directly or indirectly, supported assimilationist views that reflected prevailing government and Czech attitudes toward the Verbliebene. Given the orthodox Communist and pro-assimilationist views of these men, the perpetual conflict between the readership and the paper's leadership, which one glimpses mainly via expressions of disaffection on the newspaper's letter pages, seems inevitable. This conflict did not diminish the readership's

[37] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 29 March 1968. 1

[38] In a 2006 interview, Lenka Reinerová casually mentioned that Schalek lived in her building, noting that this was the case because they had received these adjacent apartments decades earlier due to their association with the newspaper (her husband, Theodor Balk, was part of the editorial team). Given Schalek's central role in the newspaper's early years, learning that he was still alive raised the thrilling prospect of an interview. Reinerová, however, quelled such hopes, noting that he was in poor health and senile. He died later that year.

dedication to the newspaper, if only on account of their lack of options. From its beginnings, the paper was widely read throughout the German community. Despite Normalization and the wave of emigration it instigated, circulation remained strong in 1970 at 20,000 (Maier 1970, 75). Even Verbliebene who loathed its political overtones read it, since it represented the only consistent source of information about their community. Lenka Reinerová, one of the few Verbliebene writers with an international reputation, made no secret of her contempt for the newspaper and its editors-in-chief, yet also freely admitted that she read it. In a 2006 interview with me, she revealed that some readers, herself included, had disparagingly referred to AuF as *Aufbausch und Friedhof* [loosely: Puffery and Graveyard] (pers. comm.).

As noted earlier in this section, readers wanted the paper to support their cultural aspirations. Far from merely desiring entertainment to distract them from their daily lives, the readership seems to have sensed intuitively that the lack of schools and German-language culture threatened the future viability of their ethnic community. Any German-speaking parents raising children after 1946 in Czechoslovakia would have been confronted with the lack of German-language media and cultural materials in their own homes. There are numerous accounts of Verbliebene children who spoke better Czech than German, speaking the latter only at home with their parents. This atmosphere helps explain the consistency and vehemence with which readers demanded more cultural support from their newspaper and, after 1969, from the organization ostensibly created to further their cultural development. As early as 1953—an era known more for Stalinist purges than sharp public statements from oppressed minorities—readers began using the newspaper's letters page to articulate their expectations. Jan Grünhut chastised AuF, focusing on the newspaper's role in not only providing news, but creating a platform for cultural expression and growth:

> Unsere Zeitung, als Kulturorgan, hätte sich nun zur Aufgabe machen müssen, diese Talente zu pflegen und zu fördern und weiter das eine oder andere Gedicht, mit eigener Abänderung oder Kürzung, wo dies notwendig gewesen wäre, zum Abdruck zu bringen. So aber erschienen in den letzten Monaten seit März nur sage und schreibe: zwei Gedichte. Unsere Zeitung wurde für die Leser deutscher Sprache in der Tschechoslowakei ins Leben gerufen und seine Existenz hängt von diesen Lesern und deren Mitarbeit ab. Deshalb müssten die Leser auch an der Mitarbeit interessiert werden, indem man sie dazu anspornt und sie öfters sowohl in Prosa wie auch in Poesie zu Wort kommen lässt, sie so zu

> Mitarbeitern erzieht. Dazu müsste man ihnen jedoch das Vorrecht auf den leider so knappen Raum unserer Zeitung einräumen![39]

In the same letter, Grünhut also encouraged other readers to express their criticisms openly, as these would help the newspaper improve. Whether Grünhut knew or understood that central authorities dictated the bulk of the newspaper's content is unclear, but he initiates a critical theme that weaves its way through the entire history of the newspaper during the Communist period. The following week, Hellmut Müller (pseudonym for Walter Drahotský), a prolific writer whose poems and stories appeared for many years in the paper, joined Grünhut's call for more poetry, but also urged would-be poets to review their own work and subject it to peer criticism before submitting it. He wanted the quality to rise, but agreed with Grünhut's sentiment that for this improvement to occur the newspaper needed actively to support community ambitions.[40]

The editors responded in various ways to this persistent call for more support for the literary community. An article from 1957 noted a newspaper-sponsored twelve-day course for potential contributors to the paper. This course offered participants instruction in the basics of reporting, but also schooled them in the political ideology of the day.[41] More closely connected to the literary aspirations, they also staged a number of literary contests, as detailed more closely in the subsequent chapter. In sum, these efforts failed to satisfy the basic demand as formulated by Grünhut in 1953, repeated by scores of other letter writers over the following decades, for more literary content and more support for the literary ambitions of community members. Given the ideological positions of the newspaper's editors and its stark contrast to the largely apolitical demands of the readership for cultural expression, disaffection among readers and obstinacy on the part of the editors seems to have been inevitable.

The 1989 Velvet Revolution dramatically brought the ideological conflict between the readership and the newspaper editorial position to light. Without any outward signal of a change in editorial staffing or policy and after two decades of regularly filling its front pages with bland propagandistic material, the newspaper's 1 December 1989 front page—i.e., less than two weeks after the student protest that instigated the regime's collapse—featured

---

[39] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 15 September 1953. 6
[40] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 22 September 1953. 2
[41] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 20 September 1957. 7

articles both accurately reporting events and highly critical of the Communist government. Foreshadowing what was later revealed to be an internal conflict between two editorial factions, the same edition had a page-two article with a declaration from the Kulturverband expressing its full support for the conversion of the ČSSR to a true democratic state, although it had diligently affirmed the Communist Party's dominance for the previous twenty years. Within a very short time, however, external events marginalized the remnants of hardline control. By early 1990, the newspaper routinely printed copious letters and articles harshly critical of the Kulturverband, many of which highlighted its complete failure to support the community's cultural aspirations. Dora Müller, the leader of a Kulturverband Grundorganisation (GO) in Brno / Brünn expressed this failure succinctly, first precisely quoting the organization's own statutes—"in den am 4. 4. 1977 erlassenen Satzungen des Kulturverbandes (Absatz 7, Art. 2, Teil 1) heißt es: '… unterstützt die literarische Tätigkeit heimischer deutschschreibender Autoren'"—before summarily concluding, "dies ist nie geschehen."[42] Furthermore, she questioned fundamentally the ability of the central Kulturverband's leadership to reform and lead. Müller's letter provides a bookend to the conversation set in motion by Grünhut in 1953.

Lothar Martin, a native of the GDR who moved to Prague for family reasons and worked at the PVz, belonged to the editorial faction that supported change; he briefly became editor-in-chief when the hardliners capitulated in early 1990 and mostly retired (Zimmermann 2011). In an editorial, Martin acknowledged that at that point all of the paper's editors were individuals born in the GDR, as all three Czech-born editors were on maternity leave. He suggested that the reason for the lack of native Czech-born German speakers was that they could no longer write or speak German sufficiently well to work in journalism. He also harshly criticized some members of the Kulturverband leadership who were still attempting to assert control over the newspaper; Martin alleged that these individuals were urging those who wanted to contribute to the paper to send their manuscripts to the Kulturverband first for approval.[43] This editorial and others by Martin exposed the hardened ideological position of the national Kulturverband leadership. In one such editorial, he "rehabilitates" individuals such as Schalek and Gerhard Hünigen, plausibly

[42] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 20 April 1990.
[43] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 4 May 1990. 2

asserting that they had been targets of ideological purges.[44] Ultimately, his support for reform proved his undoing at the paper. The Kulturverband still had control over the government subsidies that supported the newspaper, so it removed Martin and replaced him with the historian Uwe Müller, also originally from the GDR.[45] Müller's arrival marked the end of the public conflict between the editors and the Kulturverband. The paper reverted immediately to being a bland vehicle for officially sanctioned news. Müller departed as well within the year to found the more business-oriented *Prager Zeitung*.

In her ethnographic study of the Verbliebene in the 1990s, Eisch noted that many people remained loyal to the Kulturverband despite the overtly political nature of its national leadership. It had offered, despite its shortcomings, a home and support for cultural ambitions, even if its support never met expectations (1999, 281). One can also attribute some of this steadfast support to the dualistic nature of the Kulturverband, which since its founding had consisted of numerous local organizations (the GO – Grundorganisationen) that operated largely under local leadership, organizing cultural events, celebrating holidays, and maintaining choirs and folklore groups. The local organizations acknowledged the political nature of the national leadership, not least because of its prominent place in the newspaper, but this political orientation of the centre appears to have had little impact on the ability of the peripheral GO groups to conduct business. One should also note that the national leadership was nearly entirely male, while at the local level, one commonly saw women in leadership positions (e.g., as documented by Petrnoušková 2012). It goes beyond the scope of my research to speculate why this situation would have been the case, but it would seem to reflect the overall absence of female voices in Czech political circles of that era.

The Verbliebene Community After the Velvet Revolution

The scope I established for the literary bibliography encompasses the years 1945 to 1990, two years that marked seminal changes in the status of Germans in Czechoslovakia. 1945 saw the reestablishment of the Czechoslovak Republic and the beginning of the expulsion of the vast majority of the German population. 1990 marked the return of democratic elections to Czechoslovakia. 1990 was also a critical turning point in East-West

[44] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 11 May 1990. 1
[45] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 1 September 1990.

relations, with borders that had been tightly restricted for decades dramatically opening with few restrictions on travel. For the first time since the expulsion, Germans could now freely cross the Czechoslovak border in both directions.

Although the aftermath of the Velvet Revolution exceeds this temporal scope, I offer this brief coda in order to resolve some of the issues raised above as well as to offer readers a sense of how these new freedoms impacted the Verbliebene.

Germany and Czechoslovakia Redefine Their Relationship

The new political climate after 1990 created an opportunity for the newly reunited Germany and democratic Czechoslovakia to address the legacy of the expulsion, not least to enable the two nations to make progress toward establishing closer economic ties unburdened by unresolved antipathies. Václav Havel set the tone for this new era, commenting even before he had officially become president that the Czechs had a duty to apologize for the injustice they inflicted upon the Germans. Subsequently, the two governments signed several formal agreements that spoke to this topic. In the 1992 Nachbarschafts- und Freundschaftsvertrag, the Czechs expressed their regret for violence that occurred during the expulsions. The Versöhnungserklärung of 1997 went a step further, with Helmut Kohl asking forgiveness for German crimes, while Václav Klaus declared the expulsion (he used "odsun") unjust. As Witte notes, the 1997 agreement put some matters to rest by acknowledging the past, but avoided issues that would prove to influence future relations, such as longstanding property and restitution claims (2002, 177). Common to both agreements was a failure to mention the still extant Verbliebene community or to address their specific needs. One singularly positive outcome of these Czech-German conversations was the establishment, in 1990, of the joint Deutsch-Tschechoslowakische Historiker-Kommission at the initiative of the respective foreign ministers at the time, Klaus Kinkel and Jiří Dienstbier.[46]

In this new environment, the situation of the Verbliebene has remained fairly static. In the mid-aughts of this century, the Czech government under Prime Minister Jiří Paroubek briefly entertained the notion of fulfilling the promise of a "humanitarian gesture" toward the Verbliebene that had been initiated by preceding governments at the urging of the

[46] After Czechoslovakia peacefully split into the Czech and Slovak Republics on 1 January 1993, the commission became the Deutsch-Tschechische und Deutsch-Slowakische Historikerkommission.

Verbliebene. As proposed, the gesture would have entailed the government issuing an apology and paying a small, symbolic amount to Verbliebene negatively impacted by the expulsion. The Czech government's reports on the status of minorities from 2003-2006 made mention of this process. The 2005 report mentioned that "most members, especially the older generation of the German minority, were very disappointed with a letter from the Deputy Prime Minister … briefly stating that the entire matter had been resolved by Prime Minister Paroubek's apology" (Council for National Minorities 2006, 158). The 2006 report included an expression of the German community's disappointment "despite … an apology from the Czech Government, the matter of a humanitarian gesture remains unresolved, and therefore Germans in the Czech Republic continue to feel like second-class citizens" (Council for National Minorities 2007, 137). To my knowledge, the Czech government has never paid any compensation for events related to the expulsion to its German citizens.

Coda – division and decline

Within the community, the post-revolution years led to significant changes. The longstanding, latent tension that had expressed itself as a persistent conflict between the newspaper's readership and the leadership of both the newspaper and the Kulturverband now came out into the open. Not surprisingly, it quickly coalesced along political lines, with those who had felt subjugated or ignored by the leadership forming a faction that accused anyone with ties to either the newspaper or Kulturverband of being diehard Communists. Broad disaffection with the Kulturverband led to a push to found an alternative national organization. One of the prominent figures behind this movement was Fritz Schalek. After negotiations between the Kulturverband and the Civic Forum[47] broke down, Schalek and others initiated the Verband der Deutschen in der Tschechoslowakei (VdD). Walter Kreibich, speaking implicitly on behalf of the leadership of the Kulturverband, resignedly criticized those creating the schism and asserted the assimilationist view favoured by the leadership:

> Also wozu Fritz Schaleks Quertreiberei? Das Aufrühren von stehenden Gewässern sollte er stärkeren Verbänden überlassen, denn die Kräfte der letzten alten Deutschen haben schon sehr nachgelassen, ihre Reihen werden immer lichter, und ihr Nachwuchs war in den 45 Nachkriegsjahren genötigt, sich zu assimilieren. Auch sind die Gewässer, die er meint, schon

[47] Civic Forum was an initiative created during the 1989 revolution that sought to unite a broad spectrum of democratically inclined organizations.

> am Austrocknen. Die Stagnation brauchte dringend frischeres Wasser aus stärkeren, sauberen Quellen, als heute zur Verfügung stehen.[48]

Rosemarie Knapova, a KV member and its chair in the late 1990s and early 2000s, claimed that after the revolution, "Vertreter von Deutschen" approached the KV and demanded that its leadership resign. She failed to specify if these were people from the Vertriebene community, the Verbliebene community, or others, perhaps from the FRG. She also rebuffed the notion that the organization was inherently Communist, insisting that while during the Communist era the National Front, which exercised oversight over all political and quasi-political associations in Czechoslovakia, demanded that Communists occupy all leadership roles at the national level, at the local level the Communists had had little authority or influence (Sliva 2003a). Whether her assertion was true or not, antipathies were too strong for many to consider continuing to work with the KV.

In 1990, the VdD became known as the Landesversammlung der Deutschen in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien and still exists today, as does the Kulturverband. The antagonisms between the two organizations have softened in the intervening years, as the principal figures from the Communist era have died or withdrawn from public roles. The leadership of both organizations is now largely in the hands of individuals born after the expulsion. Pictures of events in recent years found on the Websites of both organizations document visually that the audience for meetings and events is older, mostly elderly women. The community reports included in the Czech government's annual *Report on the Situation of National Minorities* reflect this demographic trend, noting that the German population is aging and lacks intellectual leadership (e.g., 2001, 69). The reports also describe how Germans are still irritated by measures such as Slavicized names and occasionally still face discrimination. The reports also stress that the discrimination emanates from the older Czech generation, while younger Czechs no longer seem to care much about Germans in their midst.

The loss of the PVz in 2006 hit older members of the community hard. While there is still a subsidized German-language community newspaper (the *LandesEcho*, previously known as the *Landes-Zeitung* and associated closely with the Landesversammlung), older individuals affectionately clung to the PVz despite its shortcomings. The Czechoslovak

---

[48] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 25 May 1990. 3

government provided subsidies to both newspapers for a number of years, but altered the funding model around the turn of the century, reducing the subsidy to 70% of the newspaper's operating costs (Council for National Minorities 2003, 77). The aged and geographically dispersed readership of PVz could not provide the other 30%; advertisers were also uninterested in this population. After nearly fifty-five years of continuous publication, the last issue appeared early 2006.

Conclusion

The preceding chapter addresses my second research question. My analysis sheds light on the impact of shifts in Czechoslovak policy toward the German minority on specific aspects of cultural life in the Vertriebene community. Previous accounts have noted the major milestones such as the granting of citizenship, the permission to create and consume German-language media, and the right to form cultural associations, but these accounts have mainly stayed at the level of national policy, rarely delving into the actual changes the policies brought to the Vertriebene. Additionally, I have shed light on the internal cultural politics of the Vertriebene community, noting the strong influence of Communist orthodoxy on the development of relationships between cultural leaders and members of the community. Others' accounts mentioned in this chapter may offer details on specific aspects or moments of Verbliebene history, but lack the "longitudinal" ethnographic aspect of the approach I pursued. My contributions address major lacunae in scholarship on the Verbliebene by constructing a coherent narrative and timeline and highlighting broader trends and issues within the community. This work enables further research and provides the background necessary to situate the literary bibliography in a comprehensible context.

Chapter 3. Bibliography of Verbliebene Literature

Goals and Purpose of the Bibliography

The primary motivation for compiling a bibliography of literary works written by German-speaking writers living in Czechoslovakia after the expulsions of 1945 and 1946 was to attempt to document, if possible, a tangible manifestation of the cultural life of the Verbliebene. The choice to focus on literary texts as a cultural expression was not arbitrary. For one, the tradition of German-language literature emerging from these lands was strong and widely documented. Not least, the Prague German circle that included Kafka, Werfel, and Brod, among others, as well as the nineteenth-century tradition represented by figures such as Ebner-Eschenbach and Stifter, established the literary legacy of German speakers from this geographical realm. The other reason to focus on literature is that it tends to manifest itself in forms that are retained through the practices of libraries and archives, while other forms such as music and the dramatic or visual arts are less likely to be consistently collected or documented by memory institutions.[49]

More generally, however, the goal is to shed light on the cultural life of a group whose culture was seldom recorded. The literary texts I document do not constitute a major corpus and certainly nothing that scholars could consider *a* literature akin to pre-war Prague German literature. Given that most of the texts appeared in the pages of a heavily censored newspaper in a Communist regime, it would be easy to dismiss them as ideologically tainted and amateurish ephemera. Yet these modest literary efforts represent, for many Verbliebene, their only vehicle to give voice to their existence and cultural practices. Härtel captures the importance of documenting this activity:

> Jede auch noch so schwache Äußerung kulturellen Lebens sollte prinzipiell zunächst einmal zur Kenntnis genommen und gewürdigt werden, ohne dabei in naive und voreilige Bewunderung zu verfallen ... jedoch wäre es genauso unangebracht und verriete einen Hang zur anderen Seite, wollte man von vornherein alles ablehnen und für unecht erklären, nur weil es unter gewissen, für die Entfaltung eines freien Geisteslebens ungünstigen Bedingungen entstanden ist. (Härtel 1981a, 172)

[49] Memory institution is a collective term used to describe libraries, archives, museums, galleries, and other institutions or entities that maintain portions of the public record.

Few historians or sociologists and no scholars of literature have written about the lived experience of the Verbliebene, as the combination of being overshadowed by a large and vocal expellee community as well as existing as a marginalized and often despised minority within a nation the language of which is not commonly spoken outside of the country; both factors contribute to a cloud of uncertainty that envelopes this small and steadily diminishing community. That this all played out in the Cold War era with its Communist regimes that severely restricted travel and controlled the flow of information only compounds the situation. Yet, at the end of the twentieth century, as scholars and pundits began to question more insistently the common narratives of German collective guilt, looking further afield to document the trials and existence of Germans and other "perpetrator" peoples, examining this community more closely before its remaining members passed away seemed pertinent and necessary.

The scholarship on the Verbliebene that does exist, such as the highly detailed work by Staněk, tends to treat the community as a monolithic whole, focusing on statistical, political, economic, and geographical aspects of their existence. Individuals rarely emerge in these narratives, and we learn little of their views or aspirations. Given the lack of resources upon which historians and others could draw if they sought to delve into more local or individual concerns, this lacuna is an unsurprising outcome. The lack of individual details typically reduces the prevailing view of the Verbliebene, however, to a set of oft-recited factual assertions: those that remained were kept for their skilled labour, lived in mixed marriages, or were antifascists; they lived widely geographically dispersed; their numbers decreased steadily due to assimilation and emigration; they had no schools and no intelligentsia. While these points are all broadly accurate, they have become static, reifying depictions; as such, they demand closer inquiry. This bibliography of literary contributions is intended to provide a useful primary source for scholars seeking to interrogate these broad assumptions.

A Bibliography with No (or Few) Books

In many national contexts, compiling a bibliography of literary contributions by a defined minority would present a challenging but manageable task. With the wide array of bibliographic tools at the disposal of the modern researcher, the major challenge would be to identify names of individuals from the relevant community who write or wrote literature.

Once armed with a list of names, a researcher could then fairly easily identify the books they had published within a given timeframe.

In the case of those writing in German in Czechoslovakia between 1945 and 1990, it is not nearly so straightforward. With the exception of a few select individuals, these writers had virtually no domestic publishing outlets available to them. In a planned economy with strong central control, one could not just—in an entrepreneurial spirit—found a small press and produce print runs of local poetry or stories. Given the well-documented material shortages inherent in the Soviet bloc as well as a strong culture of censorship, whether state- or self-censorship, a venture of this nature would have been nearly impossible. Often, in the Soviet sphere, even mildly provocative texts or even 'harmless' texts by writers branded as non-conforming could only be published as Samizdat, typed by hand, bound in small quantities, and circulated to a small circle of friends. Czechoslovakia had a particularly vibrant and productive Samizdat culture, as documented in a bibliography issued by the National Library of the Czech Republic (Hanáková 1997). Even a celebrated Czech writer such as Bohumil Hrabal could recount how it took years to work a book through the restrictions and into publication (Hrabal 1998, 177-78).

Aside from the economic conditions, there is also the fact that between 1945 and 1990, the German-speaking minority represented an increasingly small segment of the overall population. Even at its peak size, the post-expulsion population never represented a significant portion of the population. Even if there had been great writers, there would have been no market; in fact, the few notable writers in the community fortunate enough to publish books did so in the GDR. There were entirely valid reasons for Czech and Slovak publishers to abstain from issuing German titles from domestic authors. Aside from the community's small size and attendant lack of market, there were also—by virtue of the national policies that restricted the ability of citizens of German ethnicity to assert their nationality collectively—no German-language schools after 1945. This was a deliberate tactic to force assimilation and had the obvious impact of coercing children with German-speaking parents to use Czech if they wished to succeed in life. Even in a centrally controlled economy where profit and loss were somewhat relativized concepts, publishing books for a steadily shrinking pool of German speakers would not seem a wise tactic for any publisher seeking to sustain a business model. Compounded by the general economic situation which made even the basics of life into rare commodities—including paper—the prospect that a

Czech publisher would have published a German literary title from a domestic author was laughably remote.

Kreibich "Affair"

In addition to these economically grounded reasons, Czech publishers would also have exhibited the latent anti-German hostility that persisted post-expulsion. We have little or no substantive evidence of such rejection, other than the nearly complete lack of titles produced and a steady stream of anecdotal complaints in the sole German-language newspaper about the lack of publishing outlets. In one rare instance, however, a review for a manuscript that was never published did survive. While the reviewer attempts to make a textual case against publication, it is clear from the tone that the reviewer was negatively predisposed toward the book, despite the fact that the same content had just been published in Czech. That work—*Těsný domov - širý svět* (*Narrow Homeland – Wide World*) was an autobiographical piece by Karl Kreibich (1883-1966), published in Czech in 1968 by Severočeské nakladatelství (Nordböhmische Verlagsanstalt). Given that it was published posthumously and that the book lists the names Miroslav Klír and Vladimír Kneř as editors and collaborators, one could question whether the published book reflected only what Kreibich had actually written. This skepticism is further justified when one considers Kreibich's letters published by the PVz during the 1968 Prague Spring thaw. In these letters from 1955, directed at the Communist Party leadership, Kreibich frankly and critically addresses core Party matters, including the Slánský trials. One particular point of contention he raised is the assertion during the trial that all of the Jewish party members condemned and convicted were assumed *de facto* to be Zionists. In Brügel's reading, these critical letters represent Kreibich's break from the party line as early as 1955 (1985, 388). As further evidence, Brügel notes that Kreibich's death in 1966 received only a brief notice in the newspaper, a drastic departure from protocol for an individual who was a party founder and one of its oldest members (Ibid., 388).

The manuscript review mentions the Czech original as it harshly rejects the German-language reworking of the text by Marie Charlotte Kreibich, Kreibich's wife. One could speculate, however, given Kreibich's facility with both languages and his many publications in German in AuF that the manuscript actually represents his autobiographical writings that his wife co-wrote or edited. Marie Charlotte Kreibich had been refused membership in the

Communist Party due to her Jewish heritage, another point of contention between Kreibich and party leadership, according to Brügel (Ibid., 388). In any event, the review allows that while there were no "Abweichungen vom Kern der Sache und ursprünglichen Schilderung" that the use of "volkstümlicher" and "schulaufgabenmässige" language rendered the work entirely unacceptable. It is worth noting that the language of the review itself would indicate that the writer was neither Czech nor a German speaker native to Czechoslovakia. Its dry yet authoritative tone would indicate a native speaker of German, while the harsh rejection of dialect would perhaps point to a reviewer from outside the country, perhaps the GDR. That all of this occurred in 1968 is also likely not coincidental. In the atmosphere of the Prague Spring, where for the first time the German minority was granted the ability to form associations, many perhaps interpreted the general relaxation of cultural restrictions as a sign of a thawing in anti-German feeling. This review perhaps indicates the superficiality of that 1968 moment, as subsequent political events also made evident. While this is just one incident, the fact that the work at hand is the autobiography of one of the founders of the Czechoslovak Communist Party as reworked by his own wife in their native language vividly illustrates the futility of attempting to publish a post-war work in German in Czechoslovakia.

Alternative Bibliographic Sources

Studying the Czechoslovak national bibliography made clear that the search for contemporary German-language literary books from Czechoslovakia would be largely futile. Fortunately, the bibliography that Tomáš Staněk provides in his book *Německá menšina v českých zemích 1948-1989* (The German Minority in the Czech Lands, 1948-1989) alerted me to the existence of what appeared to be a German-language newspaper published after the war; access to these newspapers is what made this project possible. It opened up the door to constant cultural dialogue. The paper commenced publication on September 27, 1951, as *Aufbau und Frieden*. As an editorial in the first edition noted, the officially sanctioned purpose for the paper was "für unsere Leser ein freudig willkommener Berater, Informator und Helfer beim Aufbau des Sozialismus, zugleich aber auch Wegweiser und Ratgeber im Kampfe um die Erhaltung des Weltfriedens."[50] This highly politicized statement, typical for

[50] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 27 September 1951. 1

press publications of Soviet-bloc nations, foreshadowed the future of the paper, which struggled to balance the external demands of the Communist era with its readership's desire for a newspaper that served their interests. This tension would have a direct impact on the literary aspirations of many potential writers.

After I further reviewed the landscape of German-language publications from Czechoslovakia between 1945 and 1990, it became clear that this newspaper would be my primary source both for literary expressions as well as for detailed information about the development and challenges faced by the German-speaking minority. The newspaper's sheer persistence through the more challenging periods of Czechoslovakia's Communist era—the Slánský show trials, the military invasion to suppress the Prague Spring, and the culturally stultifying era of so-called Normalization of the early 1970s are only the more notorious examples of a period marked by constant anxiety and stress—testifies to its critical importance to the community. *Aufbau und Frieden* changed its title in 1966 to *Prager Volkszeitung* and continued publication until 2006 when the Czech government cancelled its longstanding subsidy. My initial goal when first consulting the newspaper was to use it to discover books—through reviews—that I had been unable to locate in the national bibliography, yet it quickly became clear that the newspaper could only largely confirm what I had already begun to assume, namely, that such books existed only in extremely small numbers. Yet the paper did yield what ultimately became the core of the bibliography, namely literary pieces submitted by members of the community for publication in the newspaper. The newspaper did, however, ultimately point me toward a handful of books and other texts that I included in the bibliography.

Constructing a Complete Newspaper Run

AuF and PVz are not the *New York Times*. One cannot find a run of this newspaper in the nearest research library or access its complete scanned and indexed contents in a convenient online database. There are nearly no copies of any issues to be found in all of North America. One would expect to find a full run in Prague since it was published there by a major union publisher. Prague is also home to a national library that ostensibly collects all publications from the nation's territory, yet there is no complete run available, but rather only partial runs. The newspaper no longer exists, and even when it did, its own bound

collection had been partially lost during various editorial office relocations (along with the archives documenting the newspaper's editorial work).

Moreover, the political climate in which it appeared created issues for libraries that might otherwise have been inclined to collect it. While a handful of German libraries held subscriptions to the newspaper, their runs all have major gaps. Some of these likely resulted from political turmoil that impacted delivery; 1968 and 1989-1990 are particularly challenging years. Other gaps seem simply to have resulted from typical continuity issues that impact all serial publications, with the difference being that claiming a newspaper from a publisher in a Communist nation where most staff spoke only Czech would have been challenging for a German library, aside from its being a low priority as a niche publication.

To ensure that I had searched every issue of the newspaper for literary contributions, it was necessary to piece together an intact run over a series of research trips during which I utilized the collections of five libraries. The Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin was the primary source, with the research library of the Collegium Carolinum in the Sudetendeutsches Haus, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, the Library of Congress, and the Archive of the City of Ústí nad Labem / Aussig providing issues to fill in the gaps. It was only at the archive in Ústí, the last station in this saga, that I was ultimately able to fill the final gaps that the other four libraries had in common. The archive holds the run that was held in the newspaper's editorial offices before its demise; as noted, due to lost volumes it too had gaps. Furthermore, at the time (2006) the newspaper did not appear in the City Archive's public catalogue as the archive had only recently received the volumes; a tip from the last editor of the PVz alerted me to its presence there. Accessing the volumes required a specially arranged trip to a storage bunker, where I sat on a stool leafing through poorly bound volumes in stifling heat, indicating the lack of proper climate control to retard the decay of the newsprint. I add this detail to stress the marginal and tenuous nature of this newspaper in library collections.

The following table reconstructs the run used, illustrating the inconsistency of the processes through which the newspaper entered libraries.

SB Berlin	Bayerische SB	RL Coll. Carol.	LoCongress	AC Ústí
1951-1965; 1968-1990 (with gaps)	1958, 1978, 1980, 1982, 1986, 1990 (select issues)	1966-1967 (select issues)	1966-1967 (select issues)	1982, 1990 (select issues)

Newspapers and Qualitative Research

Benedict Anderson's notion of an imagined community meshes well with the lived experience of the Verbliebene. While most scholarship positions them as actors in a binary conflict—Czechs vs. Germans—various factors conspire, upon closer inspection, to make this community less well defined. Geographic dispersal certainly plays a role in this lack of clarity, as does the fluid nature of ethnicity. One hallmark of the entire era is constant disagreement about how many Germans actually lived in Czechoslovakia. Population figures presented as fact by various researchers often conflict across studies, sometimes by orders of magnitude. In such an environment, a newspaper, as Anderson observes, "continually reassure[s]" its reader "that the imagined world is visibly rooted in everyday life … creating that remarkable confidence of community in anonymity" (2006, 35-36). Anderson's oft invoked notion of newspapers as a vehicle of "print-capitalism"—which sounds somewhat odd in the context of Communist Czechoslovakia unless one understands it more broadly as the ability to mass produce and distribute information—enabled both the regime from above and the community from below to propagate their respective notions of a German community. The regime, by virtue of control over the production of newspapers, could thus not only steer, but also constrain the cultural development of its German minority.

No matter how compromised by state control and censorship, the newspaper nevertheless represents a critical source for qualitative research on the Verbliebene. While there are scattered published interviews with members of the community as well as a few ethnographic studies (only one not in Czech), these do not represent, in sum, a significant resource for scholars. The interviews, moreover, often reveal more about the bias and intentions of the interviewer than they do about the broader community. The literary texts published in the newspaper reproduce, in contrast, the relatively unmediated voices of a geographically dispersed and socially diverse cross-section of the community.

For some ethnographic or sociological research, newspapers are often the only available source of information (Earl et al. 2004, 66). Some discount newspapers as a source for this type of inquiry since a typical pathway to the content is to use a content aggregator, such as Lexis, which can introduce various issues such as selection bias and encourages reliance on search tools that use opaque algorithms to extract results (Ibid., 68). For my

research, I bypassed such concerns by going directly to the newspaper, identifying literary content using a neutral rubric that emphasized genre over other considerations. This was more a necessity than a choice; this newspaper has neither been indexed nor included in any commercial content aggregation.

While the literary texts I recorded could be read as literature—I personally could rarely refrain from reading them, however tedious (e.g., in the early 1950s paeans to the great Stalin were common fare)—they are perhaps best understood as artefactual documents. This framing emphasizes their social role above their literary role. Coffey asserts that "If we wish to understand how organizations and social settings operate and how people work with/in them, then it makes sense to consider social actors' various activities as authors and audiences of documents" (2014, 3). Unlike in traditional literary studies, the interest here is not in textual exegesis via close reading or the application of literary theory or a study of their aesthetic reception by the reader, but rather their role in social communication. This latter factor acknowledges the "social production (and indeed consumption) of documents that gives them analytical affordance" (Ibid., 5). They are also, in themselves, social documents, illustrating Coffey's conception of the use of intertextual analysis in the documentary method (Ibid., 7). The texts I study lend themselves to this type of analysis, not least because of the context in which they appear, i.e., the newspaper context. Poems and short stories conveyed messages, both obvious and coded, among members of the community, and often reflected and commented upon various contemporary events and trends. In fact, one could suggest that the demand of intertextuality is inherent in an oppressive environment such as Communist Czechoslovakia, where only realist (or socialist realist) writing was officially encouraged. Art for art's sake was considered decadent, hence the nearly complete lack of any abstract or experimental literary pieces throughout the life of the newspaper. This lack of abstraction makes the poems and stories ultimately not 'feel' very much like literature; the intertextual distance between them and the general journalistic reporting and editorial comments is very short. Conversely, there is a nearly infinite intertextual gap between the literary contributions to the newspapers and a broader literary sphere for the simple reason that there were no other publishing outlets for this community, on the one hand, while on the other their connection to the main body of German literature was tenuous, at best, given the lack of German schools and German-language media.

The autobiographical and self-referential nature of most of the literary contributions would indicate that in sum they were, to a great extent, an effort to record publicly both the history and current state of a community that had nearly no other means or mechanisms to record this information. In fact, many factors actively discouraged this type of reflective work, not least the double threat of persecution of the author, first as a German and second as an ideologically unsound person.

Aufbau and Frieden *and* Prager Volkszeitung *as Cultural Connection*

Role of the German-Language Newspapers in the Community

Aufbau und Frieden and its successor *Die Prager Volkszeitung* played a major informational role not only in the Verbliebene community, but also in the expellee community. For the latter, in the era before 1990 it was the only consistent source of information about the remaining German community. For the former, it was not only a key source of information, but a significant part of its attempt to maintain a collective German identity. Throughout the life of the newspaper, letters to the editors reveal both how critical the newspaper was for its readers, as well as tensions between the desires of the readership and the aims—whether from conviction or direction from above, or both—of the editorial staff. Ingrid Pavel, who first worked at the *Volkszeitung* in 1971 and served as editor from 1998 until the paper's demise in 2006, stated that the first four pages of every issue were dictated by the state [this number varied by era and format], while for the remaining space various taboos and restrictions applied, e.g., the topics of environmental degradation and the expulsion were strictly off limits. She further observed that readers knew how to read between the lines to get at "real" information (Pavel 1999). Härtel mentions this practice as well, observing that while it was obvious that major media in Czechoslovakia and both West and East Germany categorically ignored the Verbliebene, even in the PVz "sucht der Leser vergebens nach konkreten Aussagen"; the reader "muß sich aus dem Berichteten erst selbst durch Vergleiche und die Kunst des Zwischen-den-Zeilen-Lesens eine Vorstellung erarbeiten" (1981a, 189). Even the frequency of the paper was a source of friction between the readership and the authorities. For decades, readers expressed their fervent desire for a daily paper, while the paper constantly shifted from being a weekly paper to being published two or three times weekly depending on the general political and economic climate. In general, one could summarize the readers' feedback as always wanting more

from the paper, in every sense; their desire to see more literary content produced by members of the community, moreover, was an enduring and dominant thread.

Another critical role played by the newspaper was maintaining its readers' connection with the German language. Given the lack of current books and other media in German, as well as the isolated and fragmented nature of the post-expulsion German-speaking community, the paper represented a sense of language continuity and community. In his study of language use in the *Volkszeitung*, Roche notes that it represented a "stilbildendes und normsetzendes Organ," an important role in a community lacking formal German-language education (Roche 1973, 295). On the basis of his linguistic study of language use in the PVz, he further asserts that "[i]nsgesamt kann das Deutsch in der CSSR als informativer und stilisierter gelten (aus den didaktischen Bemühungen), als ernster und realistischer (aus der Erfahrung der Minderheit), als toleranter, mitunter als lässig (aus Tradition), als offener und nicht so verbissen (aus Ideologie)" (Ibid., 328-329). In its role as didactic German-language guide and local information source in Czechoslovakia, it had little competition aside from limited German-language programming on Radio Prague or German television, the latter of which offered little or no locally or nationally relevant content for the Verbliebene (Ibid., 322).

The importance of the newspaper for authors as a means to express themselves in German is well captured by Peter Pont's (aka Oskar Kosta) poem "Unzertrennliches Band" in which the poet celebrates the fact that he may once again write and publish in German.[51] The poem illustrates the fact that writing in German is a stronger form of expression than declaring one's nationality on a census form, where choices may be dictated more by practical considerations than any innate sense of being one kind of person or the other. The act of writing and publishing in German, by contrast, is a far more assertive and public declaration of identity and of the group to which one declares allegiance in an intimate way. In other words, language is the prime driver of cohesion for this community, hence the undiminished desire for more opportunities for expression.

Parallel to its role in language maintenance, however, Roche also postulates, the newspaper nurtured assimilation as well. At a very basic linguistic level, he notes that the bilingualism that predominated in the German-speaking community was already eroding

[51] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 17 June 1954. 4

facility with the German language in favour of Czech expressions, such as the established habit of using the Czech *samoobsluha* rather than the German *Selbstbedienungsladen* for a self-service store (Ibid., 321). Beyond this granular level, however, he points out the paper's role in fostering more profound forms of assimiliation:

> Natürlich weiß jeder, Redakteur wie Leser, daß das gegenwärtige und zukünftige Leben von der sozialistischen Grundhaltung geprägt wird. Auf dieser Basis entwickelt die PVz didaktisch eine Assimilierungstendenz. Sie fördert nicht bewußt ein Aufgehen im Tschechischen ... sondern sie propagiert "Normalisierung" und "Konsolidierung" auch im Nationalitäten-Problem. Dieser Zustand kann traditionelle Elemente enthalten; sie werden dazu verhelfen, eine gewisse Eigenständigkeit zu begründen. (Ibid., 323)

The editors of the paper may well have been consciously aware of their role given their proximity to centres of power and influence in Prague, but for the readership, there was less desire for the paper to assist with assimilation than to offer them a chance for differentiation, to assert and maintain their German-language existence. The constant battle the readers waged with the editors for the inclusion of more literary content speaks to this divide.

Editorial Feedback

The newspaper served as a central depository for anyone writing literature in German, i.e., they submitted their works there, solicited or not. Over the history of the newspaper, this relationship was marked by tensions between the editors and would-be authors. At times the editors would invite submissions, while in the next breath or issue they would blisteringly criticize the quality of the same. Regardless of the editors' tone, throughout the life of the paper numerous editorial comments made clear that the stream of submitted publications was constant and often copious. There were also suggestions that various writers had private stashes of texts they never submitted, but it seems that, if these existed, they likely disappeared when their authors died.

One can speculate as to the reasons that the editors periodically resisted reader submissions. As editors of a centrally published newspaper, they understood well the narrow spectrum of content that they could publish under restrictive state monitoring. This condition applied to all publications of the era, of course, but as the editors of the sole German-language newspaper, they surely felt intense pressure to conform and avoid

triggering anti-German sentiments. "Safe" content occupied a very narrow space under these conditions. Additionally, the Prague-based editors of the newspaper were typically representatives (and remnants) of a class, namely, the educated intelligentsia, that was nearly nonexistent in the broader Verbliebene community. It is well known that the expulsions specifically targeted the intelligentsia, with the result that the remaining community overwhelmingly consisted of workers with limited formal education; according to Hilf, in the late 1960s 83% of Germans identified as "Arbeiterklasse" (1971, 511). The severe and exasperated tone of the editors' exhortations for quality reveal, perhaps, the tensions inherent in the class-defined Prague/province dichotomy.

Readers may have been confused by the inconsistent signals coming from the editors. At times, they seemed to encourage readers to send them their poems and stories, as the literary contests described below attest. In 1959, the editors noted that good short stories were arriving in their offices in greater quantity and that readers seemed to respond positively to them.[52] Similarly, they encouraged community participation, such as in 1966 when they created the section "Kultur aus den Kreisen" that featured cut-out feedback forms for readers to submit their opinions of the stories. This solicitation occurred in the wake of the widely unpopular shift from a thrice weekly to a weekly format in April 1966, which suggests it may have been an appeasement tactic. An editorial note from late 1967 would seem to underscore this interpretation. The editors, fending off the usual criticism of too little local content and literature, responded by noting that when they shifted to the weekly format in 1966, they had started what became known as the page 12 story, a running feature in each issue with a story by a domestic author.[53] The years following the renaming of the newspaper, i.e., 1965-1967 also marked a dramatic increase in advertisements, which consumed some of the space that had been used previously for reader-submitted content, further antagonizing the subscribers.

1968 marked a brief, yet exhilarating, departure from the usual tug-of-war between readers and editors. The proposed reforms of the Prague Spring led to a marked change in tone and content, as I detail in chapter two. In terms of the relationship between readers and editors, it was a brief moment of harmony and shared joy, as the potential for reform at

[52] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 2 April 1959. 4
[53] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 29 December 1967. 12

the national level seemed to include the realization of the right of free association for the German minority. Alas, the moment was short-lived, and in the early years of the deadening period of Normalization that descended upon the entire nation, the editors once again adopted an antagonistic tone toward their own readers. A 1971 editorial offers two examples of what the editors deemed bad poetry from readers, asserting that such poor quality is the reason that they did not print more reader contributions. The editors appeal to the would-be writers to be more self-critical toward their own poetry in order to raise its quality, employing a patronizing tone: "Seien Sie nicht vergrämt, liebe Laienautoren, so geht es leider nicht.…Wir bitten um Verständnis und raten unseren Mitarbeitern, ihren Gedichten gegenüber ein bißchen kritischer zu sein."[54] Such notices appeared fairly consistently on the editorial pages throughout this period. In one, the editors subtly reveal that aesthetic considerations are not the only criteria they employ when deciding what to print, but that appropriate political character matters as well, and they ask readers to understand that.[55] One could, adhering to Ingrid Pavel's notion of reading between the lines, interpret such a statement as a subtle apology, i.e., one could infer that perhaps the poetry and stories were not so bad, but that they would run afoul of state monitoring. The editors stressed that they rarely printed reader submissions at that time, to which the bibliography can attest.

Unfortunately, after 1968 and the years of Normalization in its wake, reader contributions printed in the newspaper slowly diminished, often disappearing entirely for long stretches. There was little discussion of this change, other than the occasional critical letter from a reader; in general, a sense of stagnation came over the paper, which came to rely more on wire service reporting while the literary contributions largely stemmed from ideologically orthodox socialist German writers from the GDR and the Soviet Union. In late 1983 and early 1984, even the stalwart page 12 tradition with its reader-contributed content—even at the height of Normalization it at least faithfully printed letters to the editor—slowly ceded way to formulaic reports on KV activities and local news items. The page 12 stories grew shorter and occasionally failed to appear at all.

[54] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 23 April 1971. 11
[55] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 23 March 1973. 11

Turning Readers into Writers

Despite this contested relationship, for most of its history the paper served as the only publishing outlet for the vast majority of the Verbliebene who wrote literature. Only a privileged few were able to publish books, and they had either made their reputations before 1938—e.g., Kisch, Fürnberg, and Weiskopf—or benefited from association with the Prague German literary world, as did Reinerová. As Paul Reimann noted on the occasion of Oskar Kosta's seventy-fifth birthday, the literary works of such an obviously gifted writer could not be found in books, but only strewn about in newspapers and magazines.[56] In the early 1950s, when Weiskopf was co-founding and editing *Neue Deutsche Literatur* and Fürnberg was an editor at *Weimarer Beiträge*, they were able to use their connections and influence to get articles, poetry, and stories by writers and critics such as Kosta, Balk, Reinerová, and Reimann published in various GDR journals. Weiskopf's death in 1955 and Fürnberg's in 1957 severed this connection permanently, leaving even these few remaining members of the intelligentsia with no outlet other than their newspaper. Most faced a publication ban in the wake of 1968 as well.

In addition to its role as a publishing outlet, the newspaper represented the only acceptable mechanism the Verbliebene had to develop writers and to attempt to establish a literary community. Fürnberg's letters offer a small but critical glimpse into the literary aspirations that some Verbliebene still harboured after the war. Before emigrating to the GDR in 1954, he noted in a letter to Weiskopf, displaying both exasperation and affection, how it seemed that everyone came to him for advice on how to write poetry and stories: "heute ... sammeln sich die trauernden Hinterbliebenen um mich und wollen, angefangen von Empfehlungen, Posten, Verlegern, Übersetzern bis zu Artikeln, Visen, Ratschlägen, was man nur in Fiebernächten ersinnen kann" (1986, 661-662). Before his death, he consistently corresponded with Karl Forster, Walter Drahotský, Oskar Kosta, and Hanuš Frank, all of whom contributed regularly to the newspaper, some prolifically. Fürnberg's early death ended this mentorship, marking a definitive end to any connection most aspiring writers among the Verbliebene had to acknowledged literary circles. Their only "mentor" after that point was the newspaper.

[56] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 23 November 1963. 7

Literary Contests

The newspaper typically enacted its role as mentor and guide to lay writers through teacherly or outright patronizing exhortations to quality, self-criticism, and better judgment. One notable exception to this approach is the tradition of literary contests, which started, perhaps significantly, while Fürnberg was still alive and corresponding with editors and writers at AuF. Ironically, had he not emigrated in 1954, we would likely have little evidence of his continued efforts to influence both the content and direction of AuF, since many of the conversations around such matters would have taken place in person and not been documented. While it is not possible to ascertain any concrete role Fürnberg may have played in establishing the literary contests, it is reasonable to assume that his influence explains, at least to a degree, the relatively generous attitude toward reader contributions that existed in the early years of the newspaper, despite the heavily oppressive Stalinist atmosphere.

The first such contest—"Wer schreibt die beste Kurzgeschichte"—was announced in February 1954 with much fanfare.[57] When the results were announced two months later, the editors added a brutally frank critique of the general quality of the submissions, setting the tone for every subsequent contest. They acknowledged that some stories showed glimmers of talent, but noted that even the winners required extensive editing to be printable. They also complained that although the contest rules clearly stated that stories should be no longer than three typewritten pages that they had received some that ran to 11 pages. In this critique, they did point out that the newspaper was trying to support the development of new "Arbeiterschriftsteller" and that this goal was laudable.[58] Such a commentary prefigures the subsequent decades of interaction between the editors and lay writers; the former decry the poor quality, while the latter overwhelm the newspaper with their submissions, blithely ignoring the toxic reception.

Some writers did not shrink from the fight, however. One of the winners in the 1954 contest wrote a withering critique of the paper on the occasion of its third anniversary. Given the tone and frankness, it is surprising that the paper chose to publish it. The writer, Stefanie Kastowsky, asserted that the paper should have been based in a city were Germans

[57] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 2 February 1954. 2
[58] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 9 April 1954. 4

actually lived (e.g., in Northern Bohemia), not in Prague where few Germans lived. She criticized the level of the language, particularly in the culture pages: "mit der Holzhacke zugespitzt und literarisch dürftig … von den Versen nicht zu reden." She also laments the lack of space devoted to stories and other literary forms. The remedy, she felt, was a daily paper.[59] This third anniversary edition contained numerous other critical letters, all clamoring for more information about and literary content from the local community, which all readers seemed to agree would require a daily paper. In predictable fashion, the editors fired back with their own criticisms of reader contributions and expectations. Aside from the specific nature of the letters and responses, their intensity and emotion are remarkable, demonstrating that at least in the 1950s there were many Verbliebene still passionate about asserting and developing a literary culture.

Although the results of this first contest were announced in April 1954, it was not until September that the paper published a notice that they would finally print the last three winners. They apologized for the delay and blamed it on lack of space. Despite these assurances, only two of the stories appeared in September, although in this same timeframe the paper had space to print stories by Mark Twain and Jaroslav Hašek. The third winner, Karl Pöhlmann, never had his story printed with an explicit notice that it was a prizewinner; a story printed on 19 November with the byline "K.P., Luby" but with no reference to the competition may, however, have been Pöhlmann's contest submission.

Perhaps chastened by their experience with the first contest, the editors did not announce the next contest until nearly two and a half years later. This contest featured two genres, poetry and prose, and explicitly listed its judges: Oskar Kosta, Theodor Balk, Maria Fritsch, Karl Havránek, Rudolf Tomis (Ministry of Culture and Education), and Edith Maliarová (Orbis Verlag). These judges were a subtle concession on the editors' part to criticism received after the first contest, which had been adjudicated within the newspaper's editorial staff. Kosta was a well-known scholar and accomplished literary translator as well as a respected writer. Balk had decades of journalistic experience and had published several non-fiction books before the war. Havránek was a frequently published contributor to the paper. The editors also requested, in contrast to the first contest,

[59] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 28 September 1954. 2

anonymous and sealed submissions so that the judges would have no knowledge of a given work's author.[60]

When the winners were announced later that year, the editors stated that while the overall quality of submissions had improved since the 1954 contest, there were still so many flaws that they chose not to award a first prize in prose or a first or second prize in poetry.[61] Among the winners in this contest were the most prolific poet to appear in the paper, Rudi Wehsner, as well as the author of the only known dramatic works to emerge from the Verbliebene community, Franz Pálka. Of the nine winners, eight were men. The relatively large number of winners misaligns with the lack of first or second prizes in both categories; this discrepancy resulted from the judges awarding second or third to multiple submissions.

The introduction of the aforementioned "page 12 story" in the mid-1960s marked the unfortunate end of these literary contests, although two others took place in 1963 and 1964. The former garnered 124 submissions from 95 writers. The latter featured a notable panel of judges; in addition to Theodor Balk, Eduard Goldstücker and Paul Reimann—noted Germanists who had organized the famous 1963 Kafka conference—joined the judges panel. Despite the qualifications of this panel, readers were so incensed with the outcome, as their letters attested, that the editors responded by starting to print literary pieces with an explicit request for readers to cast judgment, e.g., "der Leser entscheidet" or "unser bester Beitrag?".[62] This was the beginning of the shift to the page 12 tradition, which appears to have effectively stifled what had been a lively and productive dialogue encouraged by the literary contests.

Literary Life in the Community

Aside from the literary contests, the newspaper gave little evidence of events or actions that would have indicated a vibrant and developing circle of writers or readers of local literature, e.g., readings or workshops. The newspaper did document, however briefly, that there was a desire on the part of some readers for such a literary community. This occurred in the brief window of relative press freedom that began in early 1968 with the Prague

[60] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 28 September 1956. 7
[61] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 14 December 1956. 7
[62] *Aufbau und Frieden*, 8 May 1965

Spring reforms and persisted, to a lesser degree, well into 1969 until finally becoming a victim of the "normalization" period beyond 1970.

The paper reported on a meeting in April 1969 intended to bring together individuals who had known Egon Erwin Kisch personally.[63] Among those in attendance were his translator, Jarmila Hassová-Nečasová, as well as Oskar Kosta and Theodor Balk. A full report of this meeting appeared a week later,[64] while a subsequent letter to the editor noted that 40 Prague-Germans had attended.[65]

That same issue of the newspaper included an article written by former literary contest winner Gottfried Tvrdík, arguing against pessimistic assessments of German culture in Czechoslovakia. He asserted that "es ist nicht richtig, die Deutschen der Tschechoslowakei als eine kleine Gruppe nach und nach aussterbender Konsumenten anspruchsloser Kultur zu betrachten. Wir haben nur nachzuholen."[66] One week later, Tvrdík even issued a call for assistance in compiling a literary history of Germans writing in Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia, explicitly stating that he sought to include contemporary writers. Later in the same article, he noted the peculiarities of the German dialect spoken in Bohemia, requesting that readers also submit linguistic contributions: neologisms, dialect words, Czech words used in German, etc.[67] Unfortunately, these efforts never resurfaced in subsequent newspapers or appeared elsewhere.

In July 1969, a letter from the organization of Czech writers in Liberec / Reichenberg explicitly invited German writers to join their ranks.[68] As with Tvrdík's efforts, no further mention of this gesture appeared in the newspaper. The climate of the Prague Spring, which opened the door to a proposal for a German cultural organization in 1968 and subsequently to its realization in 1969 in the form of the KV, had inspired this brief burst of cultural activity and optimism. As with so many initiatives that the 1968 reform movement set in motion, Normalization and its demands for ideological purity and party loyalty stifled these literary ambitions.

---

[63] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 18 April 1969, 11
[64] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 25 April 1969
[65] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 1 May 1969
[66] Ibid., 11
[67] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 8 May 1969, 10
[68] *Prager Volkszeitung*, 18 July 1969, 11

A pair of articles from August and September of the same year illustrate this turn toward ideology over creativity. The first was an essay by Johannes Urzidil, a prominent member of the Prague German literary community who fled Czechoslovakia in the 1930s and lived mainly in the United States (1969, 7). Both the provocative topic of the article—an evocation of the vibrant Prague German literary scene prior to 1938—and the fact that the paper published anything at all by a Prague German living in the West typified the brief ideological and ethnic relaxation of the Prague Spring. Conversely, a response to Urzidil from Paul Reimann, published only a month later, reframed Urzidil's argument in ideologically correct socialist terms (1969, 7). Reimann also, unlike Urzidil, steadfastly refused to consider Prague German literature as part of German literature. Reimann's quick and precise refutation and correction of a purely "aesthetic" viewpoint on literature prefigured the newspaper's cultural pages throughout the 1970s. This type of rebuttal mirrored a broader pattern throughout Czechoslovak society; the French writer and Communist Louis Aragon famously characterized the cultural climate of post-1968 Czechoslovakia as a "Biafra des Geistes" (*Der Spiegel* 1972, 210). In such a milieu, it became impossible to pursue the German cultural aspirations expressed in 1968-1969.

"Reading" the Literature

Approaching the corpus of literature documented in the bibliography—a hodgepodge of poems and stories written by scores of authors—requires one to determine how to read and interpret it. If one views the texts not only as literature, but also as artefactual documents that invite an ethnographic approach, this dual vision does not obviate the need to cope with the challenge of interpretation. As Willig points out, interpretation depends on the "ontological and epistemological positions" adopted before interpretation commences (2013, 3). It is therefore necessary for me to acknowledge both my starting positions as well as how they influence how I choose to interpret the texts as meaningful cultural manifestations. My original approach to these texts was formed largely by my experience as a student of German literature, i.e., I read them first as literary texts and sought to place them within the universe of German literary tradition. Moreover, I sought to highlight "literary" connections and traces that could help illuminate influence and literary groupings; in other words, who knew whom and the degree of intertextuality between writers were important considerations. These approaches quickly proved to be of little utility for this

project. The literature is largely autobiographically focused and there is no evidence that any sense of a literary community existed much past the 1950s. Furthermore, the community that had existed then was fairly narrow ideologically and numerically small. Given the absence of critical voices from an active literary community that might have offered alternative interpretations, the newspaper editors' negative opinion of the literature is difficult to contradict: it is mostly formulaic and devoid of the type of linguistic and subject complexity that makes reading and analyzing literature a challenging and engaging task. Since my initial hermeneutical approach failed, it was necessary to interpret the texts using a different lens. In other words, as my opinion of the texts as "readable" literature lowered, my estimation of their cultural value increased.

That they exist at all seems a minor miracle. The ferocity with which the Czechs dismantled every aspect of what before 1938 was a vibrant, largely self-contained community of over three million German-speaking individuals who had lived in these lands for the better part of a millennium seemed to leave little room for any form of German cultural activity to develop. Until the founding of AuF in 1951, there were no German media of any kind in Czechoslovakia. There were no German schools. Any German who had held a position of civic or intellectual authority had been specifically targeted for expulsion, leaving behind a fragmented community of mostly workers with minimal formal education. Compounding nearly every type of discrimination they faced was the fact that this throttling of German culture was occurring within the confines of a broadly repressive state. Not only were the Verbliebene subject to ethnic hatred, but to ideological suspicion as well. As Staněk dryly observes, the "deformations" wrought by Communism are visited more severely on ethnic minorities (1993, 14).

In a commentary on ideology and its impact on individual thought, Geertz quotes Stark, who "holds that all forms of thought are socially conditioned in the very nature of things, but that ideology has in addition the unfortunate quality of being psychologically 'deformed'…by the pressure of personal emotions like hate, desire, anxiety, or fear" (1975, 196). This idea reinforces Staněk's "double jeopardy" assertion about Communist regimes and minorities. The Verbliebene community had valid reasons to experience anxiety and fear for decades. In the immediate post-war period, it was literally a fear of violent death at the hands of roving militias, but even after such immediate threats had abated, there was the constant fear of arbitrary confiscation, expulsion, or denunciation.

While this would apply to all individuals who either identified themselves as German or were perceived by Czechs to be German, the pressure on certain key individuals was intensified by the Slánský trials. The majority of the condemned, including Slánský himself, were Jewish, and the entire affair carries the familiar reek of a Stalinist anti-Semitic purge. The degrees of separation between the condemned and the small but influential intellectual cell of German-speaking Jews who returned to Prague after the war were few; moreover, two members of this group served in official government capacities, Weiskopf as ambassador to China and Fürnberg first as a minor official in the Ministry of Information in Prague and then as a cultural attaché in the Czechoslovak embassy in Berlin. The Slánský era saw at least two members of this small circle imprisoned—Lenka Reinerová and Oskar Kosta—while first Weiskopf and then Fürnberg emigrated to the GDR. Reinerová and her husband Theodor Balk were subsequently exiled from Prague to the provinicial Pardubice. Kosta, Reinerová, and Balk all had to contend with extended publication bans in subsequent decades as different regimes tightened and loosened their grip on cultural matters.

This darkly ideological environment and its significant impact on the small and fragile yet influential intellectual core cast a pall over the entire German community and seems to have successfully retarded the development of a cultural elite. People write literature for a variety of reasons, but generally speaking a common urge is to express and explore emotions, to use literature both to make sense of and comment upon the culture and society in which the writer lives. In this case, such an exercise was thwarted by the combination of targeted discrimination and ideological orthodoxy. The Verbliebene were unable to develop a literary community because ideological masters negated their emotions and thoughts, essentially declaring them inappropriate or even illegal. This explains the lack of genuinely expressive literature in the newspapers, even though authors penned copious texts and flooded the newspaper with them. As we have seen, the editors dismissively deemed nearly all of them to be of poor quality, but it stands to reason that many texts failed to express an ideological standpoint that would enable them to appear in the newspaper. Geertz describes such ideologies as a polluted river and refers to Bolshevism as one of the “extreme pathologies of ideological thought” (1975, 196; 199).

If most of the poems and stories written by the Verbliebene are "bad" literature according to aesthetic and literary criteria, they are still poems and stories and matter in terms of their cultural significance and their interpretation. Geertz describes the

construction of reality as a thought process, where the mind matches perception to mental models (1975, 215-16). When one reads a poem, apart from its words one sees the poem in its entirety as a symbol and matches it with a mental model. In this sense, engaging in writing is a critical act for the formation and propagation of culture. Geertz points out that such "expressive symbols" are "extrinsic sources of information in terms of which human life can be patterned ... culture patterns ... are 'programs'; they provide a template or blueprint for the organization of social and psychological processes" (Ibid., 216). This notion provides us with a means to understand, for example, Fürnberg's efforts, under very difficult and trying external circumstances, to support aspiring and struggling writers and his exhortations to them to keep writing despite their isolation. In Geertz's terms, the products of their labours--the language of their poetry and the words in their stories--are less important than their symbolic value as evidence of the existence of a unique culture distinct from the dominant Czech culture. As Geertz asserts, such symbols "come most crucially into play in situations where the particular kind of information they contain is lacking, where institutionalized guides for behavior, thought, or feeling are weak or absent" (Ibid., 218). Certainly, the decades following the expulsions represent a situation where the Verbliebene lacked such institutionalized guidance; in fact, in a cultural sense, the Czechoslovak government expressly prohibited any German organization or gathering that could have provided such structure. Geertz succinctly summarizes his thoughts using language that addresses the plight of the Verbliebene well: "It is in country unfamiliar emotionally or topographically that one needs poems and maps" (Ibid., 218).

The need for cultural symbols explains both the sincere effort made by individuals such as Fürnberg to encourage the Verbliebene to write and the persistence shown by some of these writers despite minimal public recognition and harsh editorial rejection from the newspaper. If that need exists, how can we begin to understand the position of those editors, who themselves were Verbliebene in need of cultural symbols? Fear must have played a role. Had they indulged the readers and printed their submissions and crafted a paper that met their demands, they would likely have been removed by the authorities, if not worse. Geertz offers a possible framework for understanding such a situation, when he asserts that ideology has the ability to fill the vacuum created when cultural systems are violently disrupted: "It is when neither a society's most general cultural orientations nor its most down-to-earth, 'pragmatic' ones suffice any longer to provide an adequate image of

political process that ideologies begin to become crucial as sources of sociopolitical meanings and attitudes" (Ibid., 219). Ideologies attempt to "render otherwise incomprehensible social situations meaningful," which as Geertz further asserts accounts for the "intensity with which, once accepted, they are held" (Ibid., 220). While Geertz does not say it explicitly, it seems evident that those who reject such ideologies can hold equally intense positions in opposition to the dominant ideology; when an opportunity to do so arises, they can be equally harsh toward those who espoused the ideology. While the study at hand stops at 1990, even in the earliest post-revolutionary moments in 1990, one could already see signs that those who had not held positions of power at the newspaper or in the central leadership of the KV would vociferously denounce their erstwhile leaders. Ultimately, these denunciations fragmented the already declining German community into two distinct groupings, further eroding their ability to develop and propagate their culture.

The readership's desire for the newspaper to print more of "their" literature never abated throughout the entire post-war and Communist years. It was their most consistent and loud demand, despite the many other hardships they faced living in patchwork remnants in a country that never quite resolved what to do with its remaining Germans. This persistent demand for a voice underscores the importance of cultural symbols that Geertz asserts. They sensed implicitly, perhaps, that writing and reading literature represented a central pillar of their desire to re-establish a cultural identity in the bewildering and chaotic conditions imposed upon them.

Scope of the Bibliography

I derived the entries for the bibliography from three principle sources: the community's newspaper, a small set of literary periodicals published abroad, and library catalogues (books). The vast majority of the entries stem from the newspaper. One of the major challenges when I was reviewing forty years of the newspaper and other periodicals in search of literary contributions by the Vertriebene was to develop and enforce consistent and logical criteria for inclusion. The Goethe poems occasionally printed in the newspaper obviously fell outside of the scope, but what of a story written by a Czech man who studied in Berlin, moved back to Prague, and wrote in German? It was necessary to set boundaries so that the resulting bibliography would be a clear and reliable tool for researchers to use for various purposes. In more modern terms, establishing these criteria is akin to creating a

user guide or documentation to accompany a dataset to enable data reuse and repurposing. It was always my intent to create a bibliography/dataset for the classical purpose, i.e., not as an end in itself, but rather to enable other researchers to incorporate these materials and this knowledge into their work. Ultimately, four distinct parameters emerged.

Temporal Scope

Given historical events that radically shaped and altered the community, I chose 1945 and 1990 as the temporal boundaries for the bibliography. The expulsions that began in 1945 and continued through 1946 and that reduced the German population by more than 90% mark the beginning of what one would call the post-war existence of the resident German minority in the Czech and Slovak lands. At the other end, 1990 marks the nearly complete dissolution of what had been a fairly consistent political era. Moreover, it marks the point at which travel between Czechoslovakia and the West became entirely uncomplicated, allowing many more Germans to emigrate, but, significantly, also enabling many "new" Germans to immigrate to Czechoslovakia, mainly for business purposes. Given this freedom of movement (and of information flow), the period after 1990 takes on a different character with regard to the treatment and disposition of the German minority. There is fascinating work to be done on this era and my notes contain many pointers in this direction, but it is a topic for another study.

Language

Only works originally written in German are included. For writers such as Paul Reimann, Karel Kreibich, Lenka Reinerová, and others, capable of writing original texts in both Czech and German, this means that only the latter works appear in the bibliography.

Textual Type

Given the wide variety of textual types published in a newspaper or cultural periodical, it was more important than perhaps it would be for many bibliographies to distinguish which types of texts were to be included. In general, the goal, was to include literary texts, but one needs to distinguish as unambiguously as possible what that category includes. For example, are book reviews literary texts, particularly when the reviewer uses the opportunity to write an extended essay on literary topics, i.e., a review essay? Given that the purpose of my bibliography is to document the cultural existence and development of

the German minority rather than to pursue a literary study of the texts, a wider scope seemed appropriate. To that end, the bibliography includes poems, short stories, serialized stories, essays treating literary topics, review essays, plays, travelogues, eulogies for authors, letters by established (published in book form) authors, as well as, of course, the several dozen novels and other book-length literary works to emerge from this community. With regard to essays published in sources other than the community newspaper—primarily these were literary or cultural periodicals in the GDR—those written for lay audiences are considered within scope, while scholarly articles are out of scope. With regard to such scholarly publications I should note here that from the late 1940s until the early 1960s, a small handful of individuals—Kisch, Weiskopf, Wedding (Grete Weiskopf), Fürnberg, Kosta, Reimann, Balk, and Reinerová, among whom there were strong personal connections—published a steady stream of articles, mainly in the GDR literary journals *Neue Deutsche Literatur* (Weiskopf was an early editor until his death), *Weimarer Beiträge* (which Fürnberg edited until his death), and *Aufbau - Kulturpolitische Monatsschrift*. For a variety of reasons, set in motion by the early deaths of Weiskopf and Fürnberg—vital conduits for German-speaking authors in Czechoslovakia to the GDR's literary scene—and subsequently cemented in place by the chasm that the ill-fated Dubček-led reforms of 1967-1968 created between the GDR and Czechoslovakia, this steady stream of articles vanished entirely by 1969.

Author's Residence

Given that the goal of the bibliography is to shed light on a defined community, perhaps the most critical scope was setting a geographical boundary to eliminate noise from the dataset. Of the four scope criteria, this was the most difficult to enforce, occasionally requiring fairly extensive research to determine whether a work was written by someone in the CSSR, GDR, or beyond. While not claiming 100% accuracy, the bibliography presents a valid and consistent effort to maintain this scope. Included are any writers who published original works in German while living in the CSSR or claiming its citizenship while working abroad in an official capacity. The latter classification applies to very few individuals and only for the first decade after the war. Given this scope, some clarifications are required. First, in the case of writers who emigrated but continued to write in their new home outside Czechoslovakia, only works written during their residency are included. Secondly, some of

the writers speak Czech as their first language, only dabbling in German as students of the language. Rather than attempting to untangle the complicated linguistic knot of German-Czech bilingualism resulting from many centuries of coexistence, it seemed more prudent to include this small subset in the bibliography, not least since for many writers it would be nearly impossible to determine which language they used more frequently in daily life. This question will be addressed further in the biographical notes for the bibliography included at the end of this chapter.

The task of determining an author's nationality or place of residence is much simpler in 2017 than it was when I compiled the bibliography in the late 1990s. The emergence of Wikipedia as a chaotic and inconsistent yet rich source of information on myriad obscure topics and individuals plays a key role in this work, as do the extensively detailed authority records[69] in the German and Czech National Library catalogues. Another source of information is the text contained in millions of books that have been digitized in the intervening years, primarily by Google and the Internet Archives. While many of these are not available in their entirety due to copyright restrictions and conflicts, the ability to search the full text of most has been beneficial.

Technical Note

I originally compiled the bibliography using ProCite, citation management software that was common in the 1990s but gradually fell out of use in the early twenty-first century. While due to the inherent backwards compatibility in the Windows operating system I am still able to install and run ProCite on modern hardware, the proprietary file format used by ProCite would be of little use to other scholars who lack access to the software. My challenge was therefore to migrate the bibliography to a modern bibliographic format without losing the granularity of the detailed records I had created with ProCite.

The only native export options available in ProCite are comma-separated value (csv) files or other character-delimited files (e.g., tab). This is a generic way to export a database. Such a file would fail to import correctly into modern bibliographic software such as Zotero or Mendeley unless one performed the tedious work to map columns in the file to the

[69] An authority record is a record created by a cataloguer that contains variant forms for names, titles, and subjects, with the goal of establishing a standardized heading in order to disambiguate concepts and create cross-references. Authority records for persons often contain life dates and/or known locales of activity. They also are a reliable way to access all works by a given author within a library's collection.

appropriate fields in the target software. After searching for and experimenting with various options, I settled on the solution of using the "print bibliography" function in ProCite to create a text file with the citations tagged according to the RIS[70] Export format. These tags indicate the content of each field in bibliographic terms, such that modern programs such as Zotero can correctly interpret them and import them accurately into their own internal data structure.

This process sounds fairly straightforward, but export styles in ProCite are defined in editable *.pos files. While hundreds of styles come packaged with the software, the RIS Export format is surprisingly not among them. Using Google, I attempted to locate a copy, but the ProCite Website maintained by the last firm to sell ProCite no longer exists. I stumbled across a public Dropbox link (itself also now dead) to a copy of the file and downloaded it. Once I had the file, I was able to "print" the bibliography in this format to create a text file with the proper field encoding. I then used the import file function in Zotero to ingest the RIS Format-tagged file to create a new bibliography inside Zotero.

As is common with all such data conversion processes, this import was not entirely accurate. Several fields failed to import properly. To remedy this initial failure, I inspected records of each type (book, newspaper, chapter, etc.), noting error patterns, then manually edited the export file from ProCite using global find and replace to correct the field identifiers so that they would properly map into the Zotero format. Once it was successfully imported into Zotero, I was able to export it into a comma-separated format superior to that generated by ProCite and import that file into Excel. I use this Excel version to maintain a record of authors removed from the bibliography because they are out of scope. I now maintain three versions of the bibliography on Scholars Portal Dataverse that reflect the origins and the outcome of this process: the original ProCite format (.pdt), the text output from ProCite tagged as RIS, and the resulting csv format from Zotero (https://dx.doi.org/10.14289/1.0000016).

[70] RIS = Research Information Systems, the original developers and publishers of ProCite and other citation management software packages. The RIS file format persists and is well documented, including on a specific Wikipedia page (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RIS_(file_format)).

Ensuring Accuracy

Maintaining the proper scope as well as avoiding other forms of inaccuracy required several other steps in the handling of author names and biographical data. The first was disambiguation of author names as necessary due to married names as well as the inconsistent use of the Czech feminine ending -ová for surnames. To provide a concrete example, one writer appeared in the newspaper over a number of years in three variants:

Bertl Hannich
Bertl Hannich-Cibulková
Bertl Hannichová

The paper's use of the Slavicized ending was generally inconsistent. It was not used at all in the 1950s with ethnic Germans' names, appeared increasingly throughout the 1960s, and became mandatory in the early 1970s according to Ingrid Pavel (1999). The ostensible reason was that this was how their names appeared in their official identity documents, but Pavel's personal view is that it was merely pettiness and heavy-handedness on the part of Czech officials. After 1989, the practice disappeared permanently.

For reasons that are not entirely clear, some authors chose to employ pseudonyms. Using a pseudonym is of course not an uncommon practice for noted writers who wish to maintain privacy or cultivate multiple personae for practical career reasons, but for lay authors in a small language community it is a curious practice, not least since it seems to have been common knowledge within the German community who was actually behind any given pseudonym. One could postulate that such knowledge did not extend to the Czech authorities, or at least that it would have required some effort on their part to decode such names, so perhaps this was a small gesture to avoid potential repercussions for what one had written. As Pavel notes, publishing in German allowed the PVz a small degree of freedom in terms of what it could safely publish; its readership, she asserted, was capable of reading between the lines (Pavel 1999).

Place names also presented a challenge when I tried to determine the location and identity of a writer. As with the feminine endings, practice with place names changed inconsistently over time. Depending on the external political climate, the paper would use the Czech name only, the German name only, or both. The most common practice was for the newspaper to use only the Czech place name in the byline, but the writers themselves

typically used German place names in their prose or poetry, only adding to the confusion in determining the place of residency.

One particularly vexing aspect of the newspaper was its lack of regard for proper orthography. This was likely not due to editorial negligence or lassitude, but rather a result of the likelihood that the typesetters at the union printing shop in Prague were native Czech speakers with little or no German facility (Roche 295). Given this circumstance, it is not surprising how fluid some names and concepts became orthographically. The literary critic and scholar Paul Reimann appeared at various points as Paul or Pavel, Reiman or Reimann. Dropping the second –n from a German surname is not uncommon practice to de-Germanicize a name for use in Czech (King 203). While such practices explain some of the orthographic deviations, others were likely merely the result of carelessness. While compiling the bibliography, I attempted to standardize spellings wherever possible, preferring the most commonly used form for names and/or the form explicitly employed by the author.

Authors in the Bibliography

General Profile of an Author

Lay authors penned the majority of literary contributions in the newspaper and thus also in the bibliography. Thus, very little is known about most of the authors, but through close reading of news articles, letters to the editors, obituaries, and so forth, it was possible to glean biographical details for many. In other instances, a profusion of online publications from this century—newsletters, organizational Websites, obituaries, etc.—provided critical details about otherwise unknown individuals in the bibliography.

Additionally, there are a handful of writers in the bibliography who enjoyed an international reputation as author, scholar, or critic. Most of them had made their name before the Second World War, such that their continued prominence after the war was more or less assured despite their being representatives of a small rump community. Their biographical details are generally well known. My purpose in listing them here is not to recapitulate that material, but rather to add some new nuances to their post-war activities and to contextualize them within the Verbliebene community.

Author Biographical Notes

These biographical notes are based on material compiled via multiple mechanisms:

- ancillary reading while gleaning literary texts from the newspaper
- personal interviews, both with authors and editors
- published biographical information (chiefly for noted authors)
- current Web resources
- authority records, chiefly those emanating from the German and Czech National Libraries

I present them below in the following format:

Name
D: life dates
R: residence(s) Czech / German at time of publication
O: occupation(s)
C: dates of contributions, i.e., date range between first and last item in newspaper or publication dates of books; number of total literary items published
N: notes

An asterisk (*) following a name indicates that the writer's residence at time of publication cannot be definitively determined, i.e., the writer may have been living in the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, or elsewhere. Efforts have been made to remove these individuals, but in cases where it is not possible to determine their location definitively, they remain in the bibliography.

In those instances where a woman's name appeared both in German and Slavicized forms in the newspaper, both have been provided here to avoid confusion and enable keyword searching should the newspaper ever be digitized.

For the vast majority of the authors, these data are fragmentary at best or entirely nonexistent aside from names. Nevertheless, the intent here is to enable future scholarship by collating these painstakingly collected details into a cohesive and standard format. Where data are lacking, no entry is made to enhance readability.

These notes are provided here to provide a readable and easily scanned format for specific information contained in the broader bibliography. The entire dataset is also available via an open access data repository for scholars wishing to conduct further manual or computer-driven analysis (http://dx.doi.org/10.14289/1.0000016).

A-F

A.D. – unable to determine name
C: 1953; 1

Achtner, Gustav
R: Brozany nad Ohří / Brozan
C: 1965; 1
N: Prize winner in 1964 AuF literary contest.

Aichelburg, Wolf
C: 1971; 1

Altenkrüger, Hermann
C: 1979; 1

Anderle, Ernst
R: Braňany / Prohn
C: 1954-1957; 2

Aufricht, Karl
R: Bratislava / Preßburg
C: 1956; 1

Aust, Franz
R: Králíky / indeterminate
C: 1967; 1

B.S. – unable to determine name
C: 1976; 1

Balk, Theodor (born Dragutin Fodor)
D: 22 September 1900 – 25 March 1974
R: Praha, Pardubice / Prag, Pardubitz
O: journalist, editor
C: 1955-1969; 27
N: Cultural editor for AuF and PVz from 1955 until 1968; in wake of Prague Spring expelled from Communist Party and complete publication ban. Married to Lenka Reinerová.

Bauer, Gretl
D: *28 January 1923
R: Tisá / Tissa
C: 1964-1967; 2
N: Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest. Began working for AuF and PVz beginning in the late 1960s, including as editor for domestic politics for PVz beginning in the mid-1970s, leaving in early 1978.

Baumgarten, Werner
C: 1977; 1

Bcka, Hans
R: Lipová / indeterminate
C: 1967; 1

Beckmann, Käthe
D: *1896 – 31 October 1967
R: Duchcov, Liberec, Praha / Dux, Reichenberg, Prag
C: 1953; 2
N: Joined KSČ in 1921, the year it was founded. Worked for party in Liberec in 1930s; exile in England during occupation. Returned to Prague post-war, retiring soon thereafter for health reasons. Served as member of founding editorial team for AuF.

Bernat, Franz
R: Ústí nad Labem / Aussig
C: 1964; 1
N: Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Bernt, Rudolf
R: Mlýny / Hillemühl
C: 1964; 3
N: Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Bi. – unable to determine name
C: 1955

Bielke, Günter
R: Litoměřice / Leitmeritz
C: 1977; 1

Bílá, Ellys
C: 1975; 1
N: Tied for third place in the "VZ-Leser-Wettbewerb zum Befreiungsjubiläum" marking the 30th anniversary of the arrival of Soviet troops.

Bittner, Karl
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1957; 1
N: Prize winner in 1956 AuF literary contest.

Blazek, Marta
C: 1966; 1

Bock, Oswald
R: Trmice / Türmitz

C: 1964; 1

Brod, Leo
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1960-1969; 6
N: Jewish. Prize winner in 1964 AuF literary contest. In a critical introduction to his story "Jüngster Abituriententag oder Meine Mitschüler Jedlitschka und Tannenbaum," Oskar Kosta described Brod as "ein 'Enkel' jener Prager deutschen Autoren, ... deren Thematik um das Geschehen dieser Stadt und ihrer Menschen kreiste." May have worked at AuF around 1964.

Budina, Rudolf
R: Proseč nad Nisou / Proschwitz an der Neisse
C: 1964-1965; 2
N: Third place winner in 1963 AuF short story contest. Also, prize winner in 1964 AuF literary contest.

Buller, Manfred
C: 1974; 1

Burger, Adolf
R: Slovakia
C: 1979; 1

Burger, Hanuš
D: 4 June 1909 – 13 November 1990
R: Praha / Prag
O: documentary filmmaker; television producer
C: 1955-1960; 4
N: Friend of and collaborator with Fürnberg in Communist agitprop performance groups.

Burger, Walter
R: Jablonec nad Nisou / Gablonz
C: 1951; 1

Cekal, Henriette
R: Braňany / Prohn
C: 1969; 1

Christl, Edmund
C: 1959; 1

Cisarovsky, Rudolf
R: Chomutov / Komotau
C: 1964-1967; 3
N: Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Conrad, Johannes
C: 1963; 1

Dalen
C: 1961-1968; 3

Daumann, F.
R: Kladno / Kladen
C: 1965-1967; 3

Dehmel, W.
C: 1961; 1

Deistler, Gerald
C: 1968; 1

Dienst, Stanislaus
C: 1979; 1

Distelfink, K. L.
C: 1954; 1

Dittrich, Anton
C: 1958; 1

Domazlická, Eva
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1952-1954; 9

Drahotský, Walter (used pseud. Hellmut/Helmut Müller)
D: 1926 – 21 March 1979
R: Vejprty, Praha / Weipert, Prag
O: culture editor, AuF
C: 1951-1979; 61
N: Corresponded with Louis Fürnberg, both before and after F's emigration to the GDR. F believed he had talent and helped edit poems that found publication in AuF, but was also put off by D's strident views on German classical culture. Conflicted with Josef Lenk, editor of PVz during period of normalization. Served nearly continuously as a writer and editor for AuF and PVz from 1952 until 1978; also penned a chronicle of editorial activity beginning in 1970 until his departure in 1978.

Dürbeck, Josef
R: Habartov / Habersbirk
C: 1967; 1

E.N. – unable to determine name
C: 1968; 1

E.T. – unable to determine name; author requested anonymity when submitting
C: 1990; 1

Egck, Peter
C: 1963; 2

Eichler, Max
R: Krupka / Graupen
C: 1968-1969; 2

Enzmann, Karl
R: possibly Krasnó / Schönfeld, cf. http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/52401306
C: 1955-1956; 2

Ernst, Karl
C: 1956; 1

Federn, Richard
C: 1959; 1

Fischer, Frieda
C: 1961; 1

Flunker, Friedrich
C: 1954; 1

Foelbach, Lena*
C: 1976; 1
N: Perhaps East German Kinderbuchautorin.

Forster, Karl
D: *1927
R: Sokolov / Falkenau an der Eger
O: journalist
C: 1954-1964; 7
N: Corresponded with Fürnberg directly before Fü's emigration to the GDR. Fü offered criticism and encouragement, suggesting that Fo contact *Neue Deutsche Literatur* about publishing his poetry. Part of editorial team for the PVz in the 1960s, departing in 1968.

Frank, Hanuš (Heinz)
D: 1905-1966
R: Praha / Prag
O: editor, AuF
C: 1956-1960; 9
N: Close friend of Fürnberg.

Frank, Michael
R: Sobotka / no German name
C: 1954; 1
N: Prize winner in first AuF short story contest.

Fritsch, Franz
R: Kraslice / Graslitz
C: 1969; 1

Fritsche, Ilse
C: 1990; 1

Furch, Franz
R: Bratislava / Preßburg
C: 1966; 1

Fürnberg, Louis
D: 24 May 1909 – 23 June 1957
R: Praha / Prag
O: writer, poet, editor
C: 1951-1954; 18
N: Jewish. Fürnberg continued to publish frequently in AuF after he emigrated to the GDR in 1954; additionally, his works continued to appear in both AuF and PVz posthumously. These contributions are included in the raw dataset but not in the final bibliography.

G-M

Gajdula, Milan
R: Praha / Prague
O: editor, translator, interpreter
C: 1980; 2
N: Edited domestic news pages in early 1980s for PVz

Georg, Hans
C: 1953-1961; 11

Ginter, Adolf
C: 1977; 1

Goj, Erwin (pseud. Ondra Lysohorsky)
R: Bratislava / Preßburg
C: 1979; 2
N: Polyglot who wrote in many languages.

Goldberg, Edith
C: 1967; 1

Goldstücker, Eduard
D: 30 May 1913 – 23 October 2000
R: Praha / Prag
O: professor, scholar of German literature, diplomat
C: 1958; 1
N: Jewish. G was an internationally known and respected Germanist. Emigrated to Great Britain in 1939, returning to Czechoslovakia after the war and entering their foreign service. Served as Czechoslovakian ambassador to Israel 1950-1951. Implicated and charged during the Slánský trials, he was first sentenced to death but had that commuted to a life sentence. Rehabilitated in 1955, but in the wake of the Prague Spring in 1968 again went into exile in Great Britain. Returned to Czechoslovakia in 1990 and remained there until his death.

Grimm, Peter
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1964-1965; 3
N: Editor at AuF at time of publication of his contributions. Left paper in 1968.

Gröbe, Renate
C: 1981; 1

Grötschel, Osmar (also Grötschl)
R: Rumburk / Rumburg
C: 1956; 1
N: Prize winner in 1956 AuF literary contest.

Grünhut, Jan
C: 1951-1961; 5

H.P. – unable to determine name
R: Liberec / Reichenberg
C: 1951; 1

Haasová-Nečasová, Jarmila
D: 1896-1990
O: journalist, translator
C: 1958; 1
N: Close friend of and translator of numerous works by Egon Erwin Kisch.

Hager, Meta
C: 1963; 1

Hahn, Lene
R: Chomutov / Komotau
C: 1959-1961; 4

Hälbig, Anton
R: Horní Jiřetín / Ober-Georgenthal

C: 1967; 1

Hamann, Hans
C: 1963; 1

Hamburger, Helene
C: 1963-1964; 4
N: Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Hannich(ová), Bertl (also Hannich-Cibulková or Cibulková)
D: 7 October 1923 – 15 December 2006
R: Jablonec nad Nisou / Gablonz
O: actress, paralegal, translator, editor
C: 1958-1988; 5
N: H. was a member for six years of the German traveling theatre (Schiller-Theater), until its disbandment in 1962. Wrote three books in the 1990s with stories and reminiscences, all in dialect. A poem of hers published in 1961 in AuF was one of few published in dialect during the Communist era. Began working at AuF in 1960 as regional editor for Liberec / Reichenberg, continuing at least into the late 1970s.

Hanyková, E.
C: 1976; 1

Hanzlik, B.
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1967; 1

Hartoš, Benedikt
C: 1975; 1
N: Tied for second place in the "VZ-Leser-Wettbewerb zum Befreiungsjubiläum" marking the 30th anniversary of the arrival of Soviet troops.

Hatschbach, R. J.
C: 1959; 1

Havránek, Karl (used pseud. Toni)
D: 1909-1974
C: 1954-1967; 22
N: First contribution prize winner in first short story contest sponsered by AuF. Deputy chief editor of AuF beginning in 1955.

Herrmann, Ignát
C: 1987; 1

Hilbert, Erich
R: Kundratice / Kunnersdorf
C: 1967; 1

N: Kundratice was obliterated in 1974 by brown coal strip mining.

Hladík, Adolf
C: 1959; 1

Holas, Elvira
R: Vilémov u Šluknova / Wölmsdorf bei Schluckenau
C: 1990; 1

Hübner, Edwin F.
C: 1953; 1

Hübner, Franz
C: 1979; 1
N: Co-authored an autobiographical story by Hedwig Hünigerová.

Hübner, Gitta
R: Velký Grunov / Groß Grünau
C: 1969; 1

Hudcová, V.
R: Sokolov / Falkenau an der Eger
C: 1954; 1

Hünigen, Edmund
D: 22 January 1897 – 3 April 1971
R: Liberec / Reichenberg
C: 1964; 1
N: Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest. Founding member of the original German Communist Party in Czechoslovakia in 1921. Active during the 1930s in antifascist resistance; arrested immediately after occupation and interred in various prisons, ultimately being sent to the Flossenbürg concentration camp where he remained until it was liberated by the Americans. Maintained his Communist connections and activities after 1945. Worked for the Antifa-Informationsbüro in Liberec / Reichenberg in 1945-1946, assisting with the voluntary relocation process for German antifascists. After that process concluded, worked in a quarry until his retirement in 1957.

Hünigerová, Hedwig
R: Liberec / Reichenberg
C: 1979; 1
N: H is probably the same person featured in an article on 6 March 1981 under the name Hedwig Hünigen. She was the recipient of not only the *Order der Arbeit*, but also the *Gedenkmedaille der Kommunistischen Partei der Tschechoslowakei*, the *Gedenkmedaille zum 25. Jahrestag des Siegreichen Febers*, and the *Gedenkmedaille zum 30. Jahrestag der Befreiung der Tschechoslowakei durch die Sowjetarmee*.

Jehlíková, Marie

R: Frýdlant v Čechách / Friedland in Böhmen
C: 1958; 1

Jíru, Erika
C: 1958; 1

Juppa, Anton
R: Praha / Prag
O: lawyer
C: 1970; 1

Kaiser, Rudolf
R: Děčín / Tetschen
C: 1969; 1

Kastowsky, Stefanie
C: 1954; 1
N: Prize winner in first AuF short story contest.

Kessler, Heinz
C: 1954; 1

Khainová, D.
C: 1976; 1

Kindermann, Heinz
C: 1960; 1
N: Short story written entirely in dialect.

Kirpal, Helene
R: Karlovy Vary / Karlsbad
C: 1966-1967; 2

Kirpal, Irene (also Kirpalová, maiden name Grundmannová)
D: 1 January 1886 – 17 December 1977
R: Ústí nad Labem / Aussig
O: politician, activist
C: 1967; 1
N: Member of a social democratic party since 1912. In the interwar years active in political circles, including as a member of the Ústí nad Labem / Aussig city council and later the Nationalversammlung. Active opponent of Henlein and was physically attacked multiple times for this position. After the Munich agreement, she went into exile in Great Britain, aligning herself there with the social democratic circle around Josef Zinner; supported the Czechoslovak exile government and opposed Jaksch. Returned home in 1946 and resumed her active political work, particularly in the women's movement. Received national awards for her work from President Antonín Novotný on her eightieth birthday.

Kirschnek, Hans
R: Cheb / Eger
C: 1966; 1

Kisch, Egon Erwin
D: 29 April 1885 – 31 March 1948
R: Praha / Prag
O: journalist, writer
C: 1947; 2
N: K's life is well documented in numerous biographies. As he died not long after returning to Prague, his impact and interaction with the remaining German community, aside from his pre-war literary acquaintances, appears to have been limited.

Kisch, Gisel (Gisela, also Gisl)
D: 23 May 1895 – 19 April 1962
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1957; 1
N: Secretary to Clara Zetkin in the 1930s. Married E. E. Kisch, 1938.

Kiste (unable to determine name)
C: 1951; 1

Kli (unable to determine name)
C: 1954; 1

Knorr, Dietrich
C: 1978; 1

Kohlhies, Michael
C: 1958; 1
N: The name is a pseudonym, for whom is unclear, although from the text one could assume it was someone involved in the German-language traveling theater (perhaps Franz Palka? cf. Sojka, AuF 2 April 1959).

Kohlschütter, Herbert
C: 1969; 1

Komárková, Marie
C: 1968-1970; 4

Kornis, Else
D: 1889-1983
R: Prag / Praha
C: 1951; 1
N: Published extensively after 1953 in Bucharest. Unclear when she left Prague for Romania.

Kosta, Oskar (used pseud. Peter Pont)

D: 1888-1973
R: Prag / Praha
O: teacher, writer, translator
C: 1952-1970; 40
N: Jewish. Used pseudonym somewhat irregularly, but nearly always for his poetry. Close friend of Fürnberg, in whose words K played a "gracious supporting role" in the Prague German literary scene between the wars. Fürnberg held K in high esteem as a translator, recommending him to such luminaries as Marie Majerová. Was persecuted during the Slánský trials and again after 1968. His journalistic and literary contributions to AuF and PVz are qualitatively consistently among the best they published.

Krause, Oskar
C: 1975; 1
N: Received first place in the "VZ-Leser-Wettbewerb zum Befreiungsjubiläum" marking the 30th anniversary of the arrival of Soviet troops.

Krause, R.
R: Vratislavice / Maffersdorf
C: 1952; 2

Krauss-Tupetz, H.
C: 1975-1977; 2

Kreibich, Karl (also Karel)
D: 14 February 1883 – 2 August 1966
R: Praha / Prag
O: politician, writer, journalist
C: 1953-1959; 10
N: Studied at the Handelsakademie before working as journalist in Teplice / Teplitz, later in Liberec / Reichenberg where he edited the Social Democratic journal *Freigeist*. Subsequently edited the Communist *Vorwärts*. Leader of the Social Democratic youth movement before WWI, publishing several anti-war tracts in 1914 for which he was punished by being sent to the Italian front. Co-founder of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Member of Comintern executive from 1921-1925. Served in parliament in the First Republic, but fell out of favour with the Communists and was exiled to Moscow, where he edited the German edition of Lenin's works. Exile in London during the war; member of the Czechoslovak National Council. Held various political offices after 1948, including member of the Central Committee and ambassador to Moscow from 1950-1952, before again falling from favour for his critical commentary on Stalinism. Brügel suggests he withdrew from active political life in part because his Jewish wife was denied party membership (1985, 388). Brügel also notes that in 1968 the PVz published Kreibich's highly critical letters to the party dating from the early 1950s prior to de-Stalinization; he even mentioned the case of Oskar Kosta, who was imprisoned and persecuted as a result of the Slánský trial. Despite his critical founding role in the Communist Party his death received little attention and no state funeral. Autobiography published posthumously, in Czech, in 1968. Recorded by Drahotský as an honorary editor of AuF.

Kreissl, Rainer
D: 13 April 1924 – 2005
R: Teplice / Teplitz
O: art and antiquities dealer and collector
C: 1951-1961; 24
N: Born in Děkov/Dekau to Czech mother and German father. Studied art and worked for a state-run antiquities trader in Teplice. Worked on editorial team at AuF at some point prior to 1960. Emigrated to Munich in 1961, where he eventually found employment at Weinmüller-Neumeister, an art auction house. Near the end of his life, he made at least three major gifts of artworks to Czech institutions, including hundreds of Anatolian rugs, various Asian objects, and a large collection of African art. The authenticity, however, of the latter donation has been openly questioned by art experts.

Kreissler, H.
C: 1955; 1

Kröner, Josef
R: Modrá / Riegersdorf
C: 1967; 2

Kuťák, Jaroslav
D: *1956
R: Praha / Prag
O: writer, translator, television journalist
C: 1980-1985; 17
N: K is a Czech who studied Germanistik at the Humboldt University in Berlin. Worked subsequently for several years at the PVz in the early 1980s. K ultimately found success as author of detective novels, two of which have appeared in German, one translated by himself.

Lang, Josef
R: Dobechov / Dobichau
C: 1954; 1
N: Prize winner in first AuF short story contest.

Langer, Adolf
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1960; 1
N: Winner in AuF contest to write German words for a Czech May Day song. Music printed on 9 April 1960.

Langer, Hans*
C: 1981; 1

Langer, Kurt R.
C: 1973; 1

Lanner, Ingeborg
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1954-1955; 2

Lederer, Viktor
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1954-1981; 3
N: Auschwitz survivor.

Lehnert, Silvia
C: 1977; 1

Lienert, Hans
R: Nejdek / Neudek
C: 1964; 1

Linde-Klinder, Gerti
C: 1955; 1

Lindt, Karl
R: Praha / Prag
O: cultural affairs
C: 1962; 1
N: Per AuF, L wrote despite extreme nearsightedness.

Linhardt, Josef
O: tailor
C: 1954; 1

Lonková (Lonek), Edith
D: 9 June 1928 – 6 December 1984
R: Mšeno nad Nisou / Grünwald an der Neisse
O: economist, administrative aide (Kaderreferentin)
C: 1964-1982; 6
N: Member of the KV and chair of its Jablonec subgroup. Member of KSČ.

Lysohorsky, Ondra
See: Goj, Erwin

M.K. (unable to determine name, possibly Marie Komárková)
C: 1968; 2

Mach, Erich
R: Praha, Znojmo / Prag, Znaim
C: 1952-1960; 5

Mach, Rudolf

C: 1959; 1

Machleidt, Erich
D: *5 May 1909
R: Praha / Prag
O: journalist
C: 1953-1982; 15
N: Prize winner in 1956 AuF literary contest. Worked on editorial staff at AuF and PVz beginning in 1962, writing numerous cultural pieces and editing the business and sport pages.

Mahler, A.
C: 1969; 1

Majer, Hanna
C: 1967; 1

Man, Jan
C: 1973; 1

Manzer, V.
C: 1953; 1

Marousek, Helmut
R: Lom / Bruch
O: miner
C: 1961-1971; 5

Martin, Johannes
C: 1956-1958; 2

Matoušek, Josef
R: Kyjíce / Kaitz
C: 1967; 2

Matz, Hildegard
C: 1969-1970; 2

Mayer(ová), Mitzl (Marie/Maria)
D: †1980
R: Hrádek nad Nisou / Grottau
C: 1963-1969; 6

Mehl, Günther*
C: 1977; 1

Meisnar, Ota
R: Vratislavice / Maffersdorf
C: 1975; 1
N: Tied for second place in the "VZ-Leser-Wettbewerb zum Befreiungsjubiläum" marking the 30th anniversary of the arrival of Soviet troops.

Michaluk, Kläre
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1957; 1
N: Prize winner in 1956 AuF literary contest.

Michl, Anna
D: *1895
R: Varnsdorf / Warnsdorf
C: 1963; 1

Mieder, Eckhard*
C: 1979; 1

Moeller, Jan
C: 1963; 1

Morche, E.
R: Mníšek / Einsiedel
C: 1953; 1
N: Could possibly be Elisabeth Morche, mother of the brothers Morche described by Kokošková, but this is speculative.

Mühlbachová, Ilse
C: 1978; 1

Müller, Dora
D: 9 November 1920 – 1 April 2009
R: Brno / Brünn
O: writer, translator, activist
C: 1969; 1
N: Frequent contributor to PVz until the late 1970s, when she departed due to remarks on a book. Wrote extensively for three decades for the *Sudetendeutsche Zeitung* published in Munich. Studied chemistry, but was never able to practice the profession after the war. Permitted to remain in CSSR due to antifascist activities, including protecting Jewish children. During the expulsions, her family had been ordered to assemble with others in Brno for explulsion, but a Czech acquaintance put on his WWI uniform and sent the other Czechs away. Often worked under pseudonyms so that her translations could be published. Joined the KV and served as cultural advisor for Brno, later breaking away over political disagreements. Later co-founded and led the Deutscher Kulturverband der Region Brünn,

part of the LV, as well as maintained a German-Czech Begegnungszentrum in Brno. Received two awards for her work toward Czech-German reconciliation.

Müller, Hartmut
C: 1978; 1

Müller, Hellmut
See: Drahotský, Walter

Müller, Vladimir
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1976; 1

Muziková, Marie
C: 1979; 1

N-S

Nagel, Vinzenz
R: Lampertice / Lampersdorf
C: 1952; 1

Najman, Josef
C: 1959; 1

Nedved, Dora
R: Hrabačov
C: 1969; 1

Neubert, Horst*
C: 1964; 1

Neumann, Wilhelm
R: Žďár (nad Sázavou?) / Saar
C: 1969; 1

Neuparth, Rolf*
C: 1978; 1

Novák, Elisabeth
R: Mikulášovice / Nixdorf
C: 1967; 1

Novotná, Gisela
R: Antonínov / Antonsthal (or Antoniwald)
C: 1967; 1

Nowak, Max
C: 1969; 1

Ottová, Emma
R: Liberec / Reichenberg
C: 1980; 1

Pachner, Mila
C: 1961-1964; 3

Pálka, Franz
R: Žatec / Saaz
O: actor, writer
C: 1956-1961; 11
N: Actor appearing in many Schiller-Theater productions. Also wrote two published plays, one of which—Schneesturm—was staged by the theatre in 1956. His plays are the only post-war published dramatic works from the community. Prize winner in 1956 AuF literary contest.

Paputzka, J.
R: Šumperk / Mährisch-Schönberg
C: 1967; 1

Pecenka, Rudolf
R: Aš / Asch
C: 1958-1968; 6

Peinl, Franz
D: *approx. 1926
R: Černovice / Tschernowitz
O: miner
C: 1960; 1

Peuker, Helmut
R: Hrádek nad Nisou / Grottau
C: 1990; 1

Peuker, Marie
C: 1958; 1

Pfeifer, Otto (also Pfeiffer)
R: Habartov / Habersbirk
C: 1954-1959; 3
N: Prize winner in 1956 AuF literary contest.

Pleier, Anna
R: Dalovice / Dallwitz

C: 1964; 4
N: First place winner in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Pohl, Clara
C: 1967; 1

Pohl, Ernst
R: Dolní Maxov / Unter-Maxdorf
C: 1969; 1

Pöhlmann, Karl
D: * 14 May 1897
R: Luby / Schönbach
O: journalist (pre-war)
C: 1954-1969; 39
N: Imprisoned in Dachau during Third Reich. Wrote one of the few longer prose works serialized in either paper, a novel in AuF in 1960. Frequently used dialect in stories and poems. Honourable mention in AuF 1963 short story contest. Prize winner in 1964 AuF literary contest.

Poláková, Gerda
C: 1965; 1

Pont, Peter
See: Kosta, Oskar

Porsche, Richard
R: Jiříkov / Georgswalde
C: 1967-1969; 2

Poser, Erna
R: Lesov / Lessau
C: 1970; 1

Pospíchal, Adolf
D: *approx. 1913
R: Praha / Prag
O: construction worker
C: 1966-1970; 5

Pospíšil, Hugo
C: 1964; 1

Pospíšil, Roman
R: Smržovka / Morchenstern
C: 1957; 1

N: His sole contribution was a scene written for the German cultural group Arbeit und Freude from Smržovka.

Pospischil, Hugo
R: Opava / Troppau
C: 1964; 2
N: Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Pötzl, Josef
R: Karlovy Vary / Karlsbad
C: 1966-1967; 3
N: Emigrated to the Soviet Union in 1938, subsequently serving in the Soviet army. Returned to Czechoslovakia in 1947. Served in the National Assembly, ca. 1954-1964; also active in the union movement. Named General Secretary of the KV in 1970 after original leadership purged.

Pozer, Erna
R: Lesov / Lessau
C: 1956; 1

Probst, Anneliese
C: 1958; 1

Proschka, Franz
R: Jáchymov / Joachimsthal
C: 1966; 1

Pujmanová, Marie
C: 1955; 1

Pytelka, Josef
R: Sokolov / Falkenau an der Eger
C: 1966-1969; 2

Ramm, Siegfried*
C: 1973; 1

Rampa, Miroslav
C: 1954; 1

Raschke, Ullrich
C: 1967; 1

Reichmann, Vilém
R: Brno / Brünn
C: 1965; 1
N: Prize winner in 1964 AuF literary contest.

Reimann, Paul (also Reiman, Pavel)
D: 12 October 1902- 1 November 1976
R: Praha / Prag
O: literature scholar, party functionary
C: 1949-1962; 9
N: Close friend of Fürnberg, who referred to him as a new Mehring. Member of small circle of Czechoslovak German-speaking writers and intellectuals who returned to the ČSR post-1945. Stridently Marxist and prolific literary scholar, publishing several monographs and numerous articles in *Neue Deutsche Literatur*, *Weimarer Beiträge*, and other international journals.

Reinerová, Lenka (also Reiner)
D: 17 May 1916 – 27 June 2008
R: Praha, Pardubice / Prag, Pardubitz
O: editor, writer, interpreter
C: 1955-1989; 15
N: Jewish. Part of Prague German intellectual community between the wars. Member of Bert-Brecht-Club, a 1930s German cultural group. Neighbour of Kisch and worked for Weiskopf at *Arbeiter-Illustrierten-Zeitung* as of 1936 after its editorial operation moved to Prague. Out of the country when the Germans occupied Prague, she landed in France, where she was imprisoned by the French regime. Through intervention of Weiskopf and others, managed to reach Mexico, where she remained in exile, speaking Czech with Egon Erwin Kisch and working in the exile government embassy. Imprisoned again in wake of Slánský trials; spent over a year in pretrial detention before release. After release was exiled to Pardubice with husband Theodor Balk and daughter. Rehabilitated 1964 and assumed editorship of *Im Herzen Europas*, a cultural magazine targeting a foreign audience. In the wake of 1968, she again received a complete ban on publication, earning her living by doing simultaneous interpretation. Late in life received much recognition both for her largely autobiographical writing and as the last survivor of the Prague German intellectual circle. Founded the Prager Literaturhaus deutschsprachiger Autoren in 2004 with František Černý and Kurt Krolop, realizing a goal that had first been discussed in the 1960s with the participation of Eduard Goldstücker. Received citizen of honour recognition from Prague in 2002 for her work toward understanding between Czechs, Germans, and Jews, as well as honours from both the German and Czech governments.

Reska, Robert
D: *1919
R: Mariánské Lázně / Marienbad
C: 1962-1964; 11
N: Remained in ČSR due to mixed marriage. Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Richter, Paul*
C: 1982; 1

Risun, Johann

R: Mirošov / Miröschau
C: 1959; 1

Roob, Josef
D: 1919-2011
R: Medzev, Žilina / Metzenseifen, Sillein
C: 1990; 1
N: Co-founder of Karpatendeutscher Verein in der Slowakei in 1990.

Rosenblatt, Erwin
C: 1968; 1

Rudolf, Renate
C: 1960; 1

Rusinger, Alois
C: 1969-1974; 2

Sachs, Lene
C: 1959; 1

Šálek, Robert (also Schalek)
D: 20 March 1877 – 12 May 1963
R: Praha, Litoměřice / Prag, Leitmeritz
O: judge, writer, translator, philosopher
C: 1954-1960; 6
N: Chief judge in Erik Jan Hanussen trial in Litoměřice (1928-1930). Sought Fürnberg's advice for his literary efforts in the 1950s. Known for his translations, especially of poetry. Wrote numerous plays, some published between the wars: *Das Gericht, Villa Abendroth, Die Männer Gottes*. Also published poetry and other works between the wars. AuF noted a post-war poetry volume—*Das gesegnete Alter*—but no copy exists in relevant libraries. Father of AuF editor Fritz Schalek. May have been Jewish, as he lost family members in Auschwitz.

Salzer, Eva
C: 1959; 1

Sandig, Adolf
R: Lesov / Lessau
C: 1955; 1

Saudek, Rudolf
C: 1954; 1

Scheithauer, Alois
R: Domašov / Domeschau (probable – multiple options)
C: 1967; 1

Schenk, Florian
C: 1954; 1

Schier, Robert
D: *approx. 1892
R: Trutnov, Smržovka / Trautenau, Morchenstern
O: coppersmith
C: 1963-1983; 14
N: His 1965 story published in AuF was the first to be published with an explicit request from editors for reader ratings and reviews, which became fairly common practice thereafter. One of the writers who mailed copious stories and poems to the paper, per AuF on 16 February 1963.

Schimmel, Berta
R: Dlouhý důl / Langer Grund
C: 1969; 1

Schlenz, Richard
R: Bílina / Bilin
C: 1967; 1

Schmidt, Magdalena*
C: 1976; 1

Schmiedlová, Anna
D: 1898-1981
R: Jablonné v Podještědí / Deutsch Gabel
C: 1975; 1
N: Member of the Communist youth in the 1920s. Lifelong party member, honored with the medal for 'Verdienste beim Aufbau,' the Klement-Gottwald-Gedenkmedaille, and other medals. Her one published story tied for third place in the “VZ-Leser-Wettbewerb zum Befreiungsjubiläum” marking the 30th anniversary of the arrival of Soviet troops.

Schneider, Franz
R: Sokolov / Falkenau an der Eger
C: 1951-1965; 11
N: Prize winner in 1956 AuF literary contest; honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Scholze, Josef
C: 1958-1960; 2

Schröder, Adam
D: *1892
R: Líba / Liebenstein
C: 1964; 1

Schwarzbach, Bruno
R: Brumov-Bylnice / Brumow
C: 1960-1966; 2
N: Song published in 1960 won contest sponsored by AuF to write German words for a Czech May Day song.

Schwarzbach, Wilhelm
C: 1969; 1
N: Wrote a poem in dialect in place of minutes for a meeting of the new KV.

Schwarzschulz, Felicitas
C: 1977; 1

Sehan, Emilie
R: Děčín / Tetschen
C: 1964; 1
N: Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Seiffert, Hans*
C: 1960; 1

Sieredzki, Jan
C: 1959; 3

Sobota, Walter
C: 1958; 1

Sojka, Erich
D: *1902
R: Liberec / Reichenberg
O: actor, cultural functionary
C: 1958-1969; 34
N: Fled Liberec when Nazis arrived via Prague, Beirut, and Marseilles. Voluntered for French army, captured by Germans and sent to Torgau. Joined the German travelling theatre in 1960 (Schiller-Theater). Wrote one dramatic work in 1961 that was recommended for amateur theatre groups. Honourable mention in 1963 AuF short story contest.

Soušek, Ilse
R: Šternberk / (Mährisch-) Sternberg
C: 1956; 1

Sperner, Georg
R: Habartov / Habersbirk
O: miner
C: 1954-1964; 3

Stitzer, Karl

C: 1959; 1

Sylvester, Evelyn
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1959-1978; 63
N: Prize winner in 1964 AuF literary contest. Sylvester is a nom de plume; real name not known.

T-Z

T. H. – unable to determine name
C: 1952; 1

Teichmann, Johann
R: Hejtmánkovice / Hauptmannsdorf
C: 1967; 1

Tichy, Robert
R: Tašovice / Taschwitz
C: 1959-1962; 5

Tielsch, Ilse
C: 1990; 1

Tischler, Pavel
C: 1974; 1

Traxmandlová, Lenka
D: *approx. 1968
R: Koloveč / Kollautschen
C: 1981; 2
N: 13 year-old pupil.

Trieb, Hulda
C: 1964; 1
N: Wrote in dialect.

Tschap, Josef
R: Stárkov / Starkstadt
C: 1967; 1

Tvrdík, Gottfried
R: Teplice / Teplitz
C: 1956-1970; 5
N: Prize winner in 1956 AuF literary contest.

Ullsperger, Olly

C: 1968; 1

Viehweger, Lothar (also Vieweger)
C: 1987-1989; 9

Viener, Richard
R: Praha / Prag
C: 1981; 1
N: Pupil.

Vítek, Rudolf
R: Teplice / Teplitz
C: 1965; 1
N: Prize winner in 1964 AuF literary contest.

Vogel, Ernst
C: 1959; 1

Vrána, Ingeborg
R: Kryry / Kriegern
C: 1967; 1

W. B. (perhaps Walter Burger)
C: 1951; 1

Wagner, Günther*
C: 1978; 1

Weber, Gustav
C: 1954; 1
N: Prize winner in first AuF short story contest.

Wedding, Alex (pseud. for Grete Weiskopf)
D: 11 May 1905 – 15 March 1966
R: Praha / Prag
O: author
C: 1948-1953; 5
N: W was a prolific and successful author of children's and young adult titles. Married F.C. Weiskopf 1928. Lived in various countries, finally emigrating to the GDR in 1953.

Wehsner, Rudi
D: January 1933 – 6 April 2004
R: Šternberk / (Mährisch-) Sternberg
O: projectionist
C: 1956-1981; 96
N: Viennese father, mother from a mixed marriage (German father, Czech mother). Family managed to stay by reclaiming Austrian citizenship via father. Learned Czech first as a

teenager while recuperating from severe illness. Member of a small German cultural organization founded 1952 in Šternberk; group produced small plays and supported a choir. Acquainted with several AuF editors—Balk, Drahotský, Fritsch—who supported his writing and provided criticism and advice. Married Czech woman 1961; appears his children and grandchildren chose Czech identity and language. In early 2000s was chair of Verband der Deutschen in Nordmähren. By far the most prolific literary contributor to AuF and PVz. Prize winner in 1956 AuF literary contest. Double prize winner in 1964 AuF literary contest for two poems.

Weis, Peter
C: 1951; 1

Weiskopf, F.C. (Franz Carl)
D: 3 April 1900 – 14 September 1955
R: Praha / Prag
O: author, editor, diplomat
C: 1948-1953; 16
N: Jewish. Although W returned to Prague in 1945, spent many of the years before his emigration to GDR in 1953 in diplomatic service, mainly in Sweden and as ambassador in China. Life well documented in various bibliographies. Close contact with Fürnberg, whom he strongly encouraged to follow him to GDR. W's presence and enduring influence at *Neue Deutsche Literatur* enabled a number of ČSR German-language writers to publish fiction and articles there in the 1950s and 1960s. Most prominent and internationally recognized member of the post-war German-speaking community, whose emigration had a profound impact on remaining Germans.

Weiss, Andreas
R: Sokolov / Falkenau an der Eger
C: 1969; 1

Weissenborn, Hanns
C: 1969; 1

Weyrauch, Wolfgang
C: 1957; 1

Wild, Sigrid
C: 1962; 1

Wittke, Otto*
C: 1981; 1

Wolker, Jiří
C: 1967; 1

Žáček, Ivo
C: 1964; 1

Zavadil, Rosa
R: Horní Polubný / Ober-Polaun
C: 1967; 1

Zechel, Erich
C: 1965-1967; 2

Zeller, Willi
C: 1971; 1

Zethofer, Margarete
C: 1979; 1

Chapter 4: The Impact of Library Policy and Practice on Research on Marginal Communities

The research idea that led to this project originated to a significant degree in my perspective as an individual working in libraries and studying to be a librarian. In a very general sense, the ur-research question could perhaps thus best be formulated as do libraries collect and provide access to sufficient materials to perform comprehensive research on marginal communities, moreover, to do so in a time- and resource-efficient manner? As the preceding chapters have demonstrated, the short answer to this question is both yes and no. In this chapter, I return to this original motivation and reflect upon how library practice influenced my project as well as how it impacts similar research into non-hegemonic cultures. In sum, this reflection delves into the negative answer to that ur-question.

As explained in the preceding three chapters, while compiling the bibliography I repeatedly encountered challenges that stemmed from aspects of library and archival practice in North America, Germany, and the Czech Republic. As someone who at that time had already studied and worked in research libraries for a number of years, I did not find these challenges surprising. Library research on esoteric topics is exacting work. Yet at the outset of this project, I was far more optimistically inclined to assume that libraries would have the materials I needed and that the work would mainly lie in identifying and accessing it. That proved not to be entirely the case. It also became increasingly evident as I worked with the materials that I could locate, however, that library practices and policies impeded the work I was doing, i.e., objectively slowed it down, in large measure due to policies designed primarily to protect the financial resources of libraries and/or to emphasize the preservation of collections over their use by scholars. Research for the second chapter of this dissertation, which entailed reading a wide range of Czech, German, and North American historiographical treatments of the events that I had studied via bibliographic and ethnographic methods, made clear that in addition to being an annoyance, the practices and policies of libraries negatively constrain the scope and availability of information resources that disciplines for which the library or archive is the source or "laboratory" rely upon to conduct research. Broadly stated, the net effect is that while it is fairly straightforward to access the record of hegemonic cultures, it is far more challenging to

locate sources of information about or produced by minority or marginal cultures, organizations, and individuals. This imbalance fuels a sustained profusion of scholarship on phenomena widely defined as major or canonical—e.g., the Third Reich or Shakespeare—while scholars who pursue more marginal topics struggle with a lack of both primary sources and extant analysis. This state of affairs has its roots in a lack of documentary evidence or substance held or accessible in libraries and archives.

Rather than chronologically recounting the issues or attempting to categorize them according to a specific national practice, I will integrate them into a structured analysis that addresses four specific aspects of library practice that impact scholarship for these disciplines: collection development, description and cataloging, digitization and technology prioritization, and access and use policies. I will close with a discussion of how these factors intersect to influence the ability of libraries and archives in this century to support emergent forms of scholarship, such as the digital humanities. My purpose here is not to castigate specific libraries and archives for their perceived failures, but rather to highlight some shortcomings of our collective practice, as well as to contribute to the emergent discourse that questions our longstanding claim to be neutral repositories of knowledge.

Libraries as Collectors

Collection Policies

Research libraries of various types and sizes generally delimit their collection activities according to a more or less detailed collection policy. Such policies, however formulated, are essential, as they represent an attempt to align the library's purpose and mission with its means. These policies also communicate a value proposition to potential users: if you come here, this is what you can expect to find.

Libraries directly supported by government funding, such as national or state libraries, often build a significant portion of their collections on the basis of legal deposit, legislation that compels publishers subject to the laws of the nation or state to submit a specified number of copies of each publication to the library. Research libraries supported by academic institutions typically have a collection policy that reflects the disciplinary makeup of the institution, i.e., collecting intensity correlates to the particular research strengths of the institution. Some larger and/or wealthier academic institutions collect even more broadly, building research collections of international significance. In some jurisdictions,

state and university libraries are conjoined, e.g., in Germany there are numerous libraries that fulfill both roles within one organization. Common to all types and purposes, however, is the imperative to define what the library will and will not collect.

Collection policies are only as effective, however, as the institution's ability to support them or, in the case of legal deposit, to enforce them. The policies are therefore mainly prescriptive, not descriptive, perhaps even optimistically so. Many entities fail to meet fully the objectives of their collection policies for entirely plausible reasons, such as a lack of sufficient funding or expertise. Even in jurisdictions where there is a legal requirement that a publisher or body submit materials to a library or archive, this requirement does not guarantee that all relevant materials will find their way into the collection. Deposit institutions generally rely on voluntary compliance; while in many nations legal statutes stipulate penalties for non-compliance (Larivière 2000), most institutions simply lack the resources to pursue such instances consistently given the overwhelming breadth of publications in the digital era.[71] Conceptually, it is difficult for an organization to enforce the non-receipt of publications of which the institution knows nothing. Publishing is not a regulated enterprise in most nations. Therefore, to enforce deposit, libraries would require significant expertise and labour to identify all possible publications. Within academic institutions, collection development increasingly relies upon external vendors to supply relevant materials via an approval plan or digital package and upon the collective expertise of their staff at any given point in time. Few libraries, even those with broad collection mandates and extensive funding, have the means to hire sufficient subject expertise to enable them to address the topically delineated dictates of their self-imposed collection policy. Whether building collections through deposit or acquisition, then, libraries have always struggled with bringing what we typically refer to as gray literature into their collections in systematic fashion. Revolutions in desktop and online publishing have only exacerbated the problem.

[71] In a conversation (10 November 2017), Daniel Boivin of OCLC Canada related to me that in the early 1990s he had a student job with Library and Archives Canada contacting publishers about their deposit obligations. He noted that this work no longer happens at all. The fact that it was considered a student task a generation ago indicates the low importance Library and Archives Canada placed on this work.

Collecting as a "Neutral" Practice

Personal discretion also plays a significant role in library collection practice. Human intervention is inevitably necessary in library collecting practice, as the amount of material available perpetually exceeds the budget and/or labour capacity of the institution. Decisions must be made about what will find its way into the collection and what will not, decisions that are often made by individuals assigned broad subject portfolios and working alone. Such factors lead to patterns of inconsistent collecting, with some areas receiving intense focus while others are neglected entirely. This inconsistency does not generally result from ill intention, but rather reflects the interests and expertise of the staff making the decisions, as well as their biases.

While myriad pragmatic issues such as funding, expertise, and logistical barriers undermine the efficacy of collection policies, librarians tend to espouse the ethical position of neutrality with regard to collecting challenging or distasteful materials. This position finds various expressions in library science. One is Ranganathan's third law of library science: every book its reader. Statements two and seven of the American Library Association's *Code of Ethics* also communicate this sentiment, with statement two asserting that librarians will "resist all efforts to censor library resources" while seven stresses that librarians' personal beliefs should not guide their professional actions (ALA). More practically oriented expressions appear, for example, in the guidelines for the Fachinformationsdienste für die Wissenschaft (German entities funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft to replace the Sondersammelgebiet system), which state that there are no defined boundaries for what libraries may collect under this funding model if a discipline deems it necessary for research (DFG, 6-7).

The term bias carries a distinctly negative connotation and can also imply intent, therefore it may be useful to reframe this issue as one of caprice or predilection. In other words, individuals will realize a collection policy's mandates according to their own set of choices and decisions, which may or may not reflect commonly understood practices. To illustrate, as well as to offer my own professional experience as an indication of this tendency, I point out that the Yale University Library has, for North America, relatively extensive and unique holdings in East German science fiction and nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German children's picture books. The latter exist due to conversations I

had with a comparative literature scholar on the Yale faculty who had a general need for such materials but lamented their absence in library collections globally, while the former addressed an issue raised by a personal friend at another university who had laboured for years to pull together enough titles in her personal library to write her dissertation. Within the framework of my broad mandate to build a world-class German literature collection, I chose to emphasize these two areas that my predecessors had ignored entirely. In turn, by directing my attention to these two topics, I neglected others. Despite much grandiloquence from major libraries about the comprehensiveness of their collections, close analysis can always reveal evidence of gaps and omissions related to human decisions.

In recent years, library practitioners have begun to address openly the lack of neutrality inherent in library practice. Bourg and Sadler state categorically that "libraries have never been neutral repositories of knowledge," further asserting that "building collections and developing the tools to access them are inherently political acts; we are creating the future library, the tools and collections that will be used to create new knowledge" (2015). Their arguments capture well how what we collect and how we enable access to our collections reflects our own biases as professionals as well as influences the type and nature of new knowledge that scholars can create on the basis of these collections.

Collecting Verbliebene Materials

While formulating my original research proposal in 1997, I indicated that the best location for this topic in Germany would be Berlin, based on three assumptions related to the development and application of collection policies. First, the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin has long functioned, particularly before the legal reframing of Die Deutsche Bibliothek as Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek in 2006, as a library of national significance in Germany, with extensive holdings in myriad disciplines. Specifically, it was also the library responsible for collecting Slavic materials and publications from Slavic-language-speaking nations under the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft Sondersammelgebiet (SSG) system, housing these collections in its Osteuropa-Abteilung.[72] Based on these first two factors, I anticipated correctly that this library would have extensive holdings related to my potential topic. The presence of materials acquired via the SSG mandate quickly enabled me to grasp the state

[72] The Bayerische Staatsbibliothek had the SSG mandate for East, Central, and Southeast Europe, i.e., the broadest mandate for the region, but both libraries' holdings in this realm are extensive. I opted for Berlin based on the third factor.

of knowledge around post-war German-language literature from Central and Eastern European countries, allowing me to narrow the scope to Czechoslovakia, where the lack of holdings in the Staatsbibliothek indicated a significant lacuna that invited further investigation.

The third assumption I made was that the Staatsbibliothek, due to its unique history, would have particularly strong collections from its eastern neighbours, not only due to the SSG mandate, but because during the GDR's forty-year existence there had been two parallel instances of the Staatsbibliothek, one in each half of divided Berlin. Given the strong political and cultural ties between the GDR and other European Communist states, I anticipated that it would have tended to collect materials from those nations, particularly any publications in German or related to German issues.

The collections of the Staatsbibliothek, specifically the works of Czech scholars such as Tomáš Staněk, set me on the path of discovering that the Verbliebene community's newspaper would be a potentially rich source for identifying literary texts. Additionally, its holdings of this newspaper proved to be perhaps the most complete that exist in any library. Given receipt stamps present in the bound volumes of AuF and PVz, it would seem that the newspaper found its way into the Staatsbibliothek holdings via the GDR instantiation of the Staatsbibliothek; that is, I had correctly intuited the collection policies (and related practices) and their likely impact on collection strengths, based on my understanding of collection policy development.

For different reasons, the Verbliebene newspaper proves difficult to locate where one might otherwise most reasonably expect to find an intact run: in Prague at the Czech National Library. A national trade union published it, it had official status by virtue of its government subsidy, and the newspaper's editorial offices were literally within a few hundred metres of the National Library's main building. Given these factors and the concept of legal deposit, it seems obvious that this library would have the most complete run of this publication.

Returning to the critical discourse emerging around the non-neutrality of library practice, we see with this specific example how a lack of neutrality can influence how libraries implement their collection policies. On several occasions, I had occasion to visit the National Library in the late 1990s and early 2000s within the context of my research. Having identified gaps in the Staatsbibliothek's holdings for AuF and PVz, I sought to fill these by

consulting what I assumed would be a complete run in Prague. At that time, they did not have any holdings for AuF, and their PVz holdings lacked the years I needed. While there, I asked a staff member if collecting national newspapers was part of their collecting mandate, to which she replied, yes, obviously. I then pressed the matter by asking why they failed to have AuF, not least since the government at the time sanctioned and subsidized it. The response: it was in German. While the answer did not help my research, I appreciated the honesty, since it underscores the critical role that bias plays in collection development practice. It was also not an official policy statement, but rather a spontaneous explanation from an librarian. We should recognize, however, as I outlined above, that individuals carry out library policies, often with a relatively striking degree of discretion and autonomy. Given the cultural climate within Czechoslovakia during the post-war Communist era, it is unlikely that anyone working in the National Library would have championed the acquisition of German-language materials.

The Verbliebene newspaper was not a significant national or international newspaper during the years it appeared. What makes it—and many similar periodicals from around the world—invaluable, however, is that it is the richest and most consistent source of information we have on this community. This community lacked access to and influence over the infrastructure that majority populations enjoy that would have collected and preserved the newspaper, namely, libraries and archives. The institutions in its country tasked with this role failed to realize that mandate; whether through neglect or intent matters little with regard to the outcome. This oversight extends well beyond the newspaper, as well, to archival materials from the newspaper, the Kulturverband, and key individuals. The Collegium Bohemicum in Ústí nad Labem / Aussig, a research centre focused on German-Czech coexistence founded in 2006, may yet prove capable of recovering part of this legacy, but much will depend on its funding and the continued efforts of a small group of dedicated individuals. While I am focusing here on the Verbliebene community, this general dynamic of selective neglect applies to nearly every research library, which for many reasons, some valid, others less so, fail to collect materials of critical importance for understanding marginal communities.

The Limits of Collecting

Apart from the situation in German and Czech libraries, it is important to recognize that it was necessary to go to Europe in the first place to conduct this research. Theoretically, given the sheer number of large, collection-intensive academic libraries in North American and in particular in the United States, one could reasonably expect to be able to conduct similar research using their considerable combined resources. Yet, as researchers have experienced for generations, many materials simply did not and still do not find their way to North America. With regard to archival and library special collections, this absence is perfectly logical. Most archival collections consist largely of unique materials, i.e., there is only one copy of an item, while the books and manuscripts required by, for example, scholars working in pre-modern eras tend to be similarly rare and exceptional and thus reside in special collections requiring on-site use. That North American libraries and archives collectively, however, also lack myriad newspapers, books, and other comparatively common materials is perhaps less widely understood other than by those confronted with the challenge. The Library of Congress, for example, explicitly asserts that it collects materials from around the world in addition to its role as a legal deposit library for the United States. While it does collect such materials, it would be impossible for an organization even with its size and resources to do so comprehensively, cohesively, and consistently. The Library of Congress was the only North American library I could identify, for example, that held portions of AuF and PVz, yet it has only a subset of its years of publication; moreover, the microfilm reels held contain myriad gaps within a given year, rendering the holdings insufficient for many research undertakings, mine included.[73] In sum, the collection breadth of North American research libraries is immense, but often lacks depth and consistency.

Descriptive Practice and Newspapers

Such gaps in holdings—which also exist in the bound volumes held by the Staatsbibliothek—point to another critical issue that confounds efficient research, namely, the shortcomings in libraries' descriptive practices with regard to newspapers. Acquiring

[73] cf. https://lccn.loc.gov/sf86092182 (PVz holdings - permalink); https://lccn.loc.gov/59022669 and https://lccn.loc.gov/sn94089652 (AuF holdings - permalinks)

materials represents only an initial step toward making materials available to researchers. Describing and cataloguing materials at the level necessary to make them accessible via the library catalogue or other search tools is the next essential step in the process. Cataloguing still occupies a central role in library work, although many libraries are downgrading their capabilities in this area as budgets contract. This shift has dramatic consequences with regard to newspapers, which even in better financial times often failed to receive the attention due them given their critical role as primary source material for researchers.

An issue that plagues all libraries working with print materials is that serial publications often fail to arrive despite standing orders or subscriptions. These failures can and frequently do occur for many reasons: human error, postal failures, political upheaval, censorship, etc. The steps libraries take to address such issues are known as serials claiming, a practice requiring intense application of human labour and therefore generally understood to be expensive. If one considers the complications of languages, time zones, and often the lack of credible customer service, claiming is at best an art, not a reliable practice. Claiming was typically realized via subscription agents, another aspect of collection practice that inhibited the collection of relatively obscure serial publications. During the print era, research libraries could not possibly manage thousands of direct relationships with small publishers and therefore tended to use these agents to aggregate their purchases into a manageable set of portfolios placed with multiple, often geographically defined agents.[74]

The foregoing assumes, of course, that a library would be inclined to claim missing newspaper issues, an unlikely prospect given prevailing practice. While before our current digital age most research libraries routinely bound and shelved nearly every journal to which they subscribed, most did not do so with their newspapers. Libraries retained newspapers in reading rooms in unruly stacks only until the microfilm reels arrived, if that long. Even newspapers for which libraries did not purchase microfilm or for which microfilm was not available were also generally discarded, although some research libraries did retain

[74] Given these practices, it is easy to diagnose why the newspaper critical to my work fails to appear in North American collections and why the Library of Congress would have sporadic holdings. It is unlikely that even a major Western European subscription agent (e.g.- Harrassowitz) maintained a relationship with a newspaper publisher in a Communist nation. Payment would have been a constant challenge, and the amount of money involved was so paltry (in hard currency, such periodicals cost a pittance) that no viable business model would have included them. This would not have been a high-demand title, meaning that the labour necessary to handle such subscriptions would not have yielded sufficient revenue to cover costs.

print newspapers. While serials claiming applied to journals, the failure of a newspaper edition to arrive would have been unlikely to trigger a claim in even the most esoterically inclined library, even in instances where the institution intended to retain the paper edition. The Library of Congress, with its collection-intensive mandate, never performed check-in for newspapers, without which claiming is patently impossible (Cannon 2015, 183).[75]

The long history of libraries' inattention to the minute details of newspapers—however well justified by financial constraints—has diminished the utility of the newspapers that have found their way into library collections. Cannon writes extensively about the myriad issues plaguing the Library of Congress with regard to its newspaper collections (2015). Even with intensive effort devoted to improving holdings records, she notes, they "are still years away from the completion of this project and knowing our true holdings for serials" (Ibid., 184). She considers this work critical, reiterating the notion that for researchers in many academic disciplines, newspapers represent an essential primary resource (Ibid., 188).

This example from the Library of Congress demonstrates that even in libraries that collect esoteric newspapers in print, their marginal existence generally means that they receive minimal cataloging at best, with inaccurate or ambiguous holdings statements. Many holdings statements for newspapers provide only what are known as "span dates," indicating only the years for the first and last issues in the collection. Cannon also describes specifically the impact of these practices on the East European newspaper collections at the Library of Congress (2015). Their catalogue records for AuF and PVz illustrate well the widespread issues inherent in that organization's serial holdings and highlight how misleading span dates can be. With these newspapers, the problem starts with the presence of multiple catalogue records for the PVz, one of which lacks any holdings information.[76] Once one locates the record with holdings,[77] it indicates only that the library has the years 1966-1967 and 1969-1976, with no further details. In an attempt to address gaps that I had found in the Staatsbibliothek's holdings, I requested the film for 1966 and 1967 via interlibrary loan, only to discover upon receiving it that these reels were missing numerous

[75] Serials check-in is a practice where a library staff member explicitly monitors and notes the arrival of each issue of a publication based on a predictive pattern, typically recording each issue's arrival in the holdings information attached to its bibliographic record in the library catalogue. If an issue that the pattern indicated should arrive failed to do so, the staff member initiated a claim.

[76] Permalink: https://lccn.loc.gov/75640268

[77] Permalink: https://lccn.loc.gov/sf86092182

editions of the paper for both years, rendering them virtually useless. These omissions were noted on the film itself, i.e., on a frame on the reel itself, but not on the box or, as noted, in the catalogue record. This is a common occurrence with filmed newspapers that anyone who has worked with microfilm will recognize. The amount of time and effort one wastes to discover such failings can be considerable. In sum, holdings statements attached to multiple bibliographic records in the Library of Congress catalogue would imply that the Library holds AuF from 1953-1958, 1959-1962, and 1964-1965, as well as the PVz from 1966-1967, 1969-1976, 1977-1980, 1982-1983, and 1985-1990. These piecemeal holdings statements indicate that at best its run is missing many years, but offer no indication, of course, that the years they do hold are beset with major gaps. While the Library may have a representative sample of the title, its holdings would be insufficient for most scholarly purposes. Cannon noted the existence of a number of finding aids for newspapers and periodicals in the European Division, including one from 1965 that includes newspapers from Czechoslovakia (Carlton). Such finding aids often supplement the data found in catalogues. Although the holdings statement for AuF in their current catalogue would seem to indicate that long before 1965 it was already present in the library, it does not appear in this finding aid. Cannon's article underscores that even 50 years on, the department had yet to master the challenge of accurate holdings description.

Similarly, records in StaBiKat, the catalogue at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, fail to note the somewhat less fatal gaps in their bound volumes. While the holdings statements do indicate some gaps, the statements are nearly indecipherable to even an expert user.[78] Moreover, they are broadly inaccurate, per my chronological analysis of each of their bound volumes.

I point out these documentation and description shortcomings to underscore four critical points. The first is the challenge they present to users. As an experienced librarian, I bring a wealth of expertise to the search for the materials I need for my research, but for others, even experienced scholars, the processes and procedures that enable or thwart access are largely opaque, leading at least to inefficiency, at worst, to missing key materials. Additionally, only a researcher with the financial means has the luxury of going to libraries in multiple countries simply hoping that their holdings will close gaps in the record. Taken

[78] Permalink: http://lhsbb.gbv.de/DB=1/XMLPRS=N/PPN?PPN=168710323

together, these first two issues point to the third, namely, that many esoteric materials, even if they have found their way into a library collection, will elude the grasp of many researchers who would potentially benefit from engaging with them. The inability to locate critical materials undermines and narrows scholarship. The last critical point is that these bibliographic records and inaccurate holdings statements demonstrate de facto the low priority that libraries assign to processing such materials and to promoting their use.

However justifiable it may be, the low priority assigned to these marginal periodicals perpetually inhibits their visibility to researchers. Having been neither filmed nor digitized, they evade capture in meta-catalogues intended to make it easier for researchers to locate newspaper content. The International Coalition on Newspapers (ICON) database hosted by the Center for Research Libraries documents over 170,000 global newspaper titles. Its scope explicitly includes all formats, including print, but predictably, AuF and PVz do not appear in the database. Again, I use this newspaper only as a case study for thousands of similarly marginal titles.[79]

Digitization and Newspapers

Newspaper Digitization

Over the past two decades, the ability to digitize collections has emerged as a viable and desirable option for advancing both the preservation and access agendas in libraries and archives. Previously, microforms had enabled lending newspapers and similar materials over great distances as well as minimized contact with the fragile originals, but in digital form, a newspaper can theoretically be shared globally at nominal additional cost once it is made available locally. While copyright and the paywalls it erects still present major obstacles, online access to major national, regional, and municipal newspapers has become far more available via interfaces and products that third-party vendors, libraries, and occasionally the publishers themselves develop and maintain.

The digitization of historical newspapers has, however, largely consisted of scanning existing microfilm, meaning that this work has not significantly increased the content that is

[79] To extend this point using another anecdotal example, my teenage daughter recently received a copy of the Trotskyist publications *Spartacist Canada* and *Workers Vanguard* at an anti-racism rally. Although the former has been published in Toronto since 1975 and the latter in New York since 1971, neither appears in ICON, which underscores their lack of presence in libraries. The largest library in Toronto, the University of Toronto, has *Spartacist Canada* in its rare books library, but the run has myriad gaps, and there are no issues from recent years.

available for remote use. Filming newspapers was an expensive process and digitization similarly presents cost issues. The copy stands, lighting, and optics required to scan larger objects are complex, expensive, and difficult to operate and maintain. While there are multiple devices on the market that can support semi-automated production book scanning, the size and paper quality of newspapers as well as the surfeit of extant microfilm copy mean that this kind of automation and ease generally has not been developed for newspaper digitization. Even a large-scale, relatively well funded newspaper digitization project such as the National Digital Newspaper Program that the Library of Congress and the National Endowment for the Humanities support in the United States stipulates in its funding specifications that the project is "primarily based on scanning from microfilm" (Library of Congress 2016, 4). Similarly, the World Newspaper Archive based at the Center for Research Libraries in the United States relies primarily on the digitization of microfilm (Simon 2009, 87).

Even what one would consider massive digitization projects have yet to make significant progress on creating a large and diverse digitized newspaper corpus. The British Newspaper Archive—a joint project between the British Library and the for-profit vendor Findmypast—has digitized 22 million pages, which is an impressive figure, but represents only 3% of the British Library's more than 750,000,000 pages of newspaper content (Carpen 2017). Carpen, a journalist and local historian in Cambridge, astutely notes that some of the information recorded in Cambridge newspapers is also available in county archives and other sources, but that the search tools for such systems are "very temperamental" and, moreover, that such records are "not designed to be read by the curious browser" (Ibid.). His point underscores the importance of newspaper content not only for scholarly purposes, but also for broader social educational needs.

Digitization and Retrospective Cataloging

Newspaper digitization theoretically offers the potential to remedy a longstanding concern with libraries' aggregate newspaper holdings described in the previous section, namely, the inconsistent quality of the metadata records that libraries generate to create access points to their newspaper collections. Writing about the World Newspaper Archive, Simon notes that "the process of locating and preparing these materials for digitization is generating valuable preservation metadata and information about the existent holdings of

these rare materials" (Ibid., 84). Reformatting processes, whether for filming or digitizing, require a degree of engagement that brings these materials better to light, addressing longstanding issues in library catalogues and finding aids with partial or conflicting serials holding information.

Access to Esoteric Materials

Digitization has brought many benefits to researchers working with newspapers. Improved finding aids and search tools built upon detailed holdings information that emerges as a beneficial by-product of the filming and digitization processes have greatly enhanced access to newspaper content. Having accurate records not only in the library catalogue, but also in the various digital platforms through which the library provides access to its digital collections, increases the likelihood that a researcher will be able to find and efficiently utilize newspaper content. For users with the appropriate access rights, the ability to access digital content from any location has been another major step forward, enhancing the efficiency of their research.

The foregoing scenario describes the ideal, of course, and while much progress is being made toward digitizing collections, we must acknowledge that this progress is not universal. Libraries often approach the prioritization of description and digitization with the same bias and caprice present as in our collection development practices. While, furthermore, digitization has increased access for many, this benefit applies primarily to those working with materials before specific dates determined by prevailing copyright regimes. As research conducted by the Center for Research Libraries within the framework of its International Coalition on Newspapers indicates, the vast majority of digital content in North America is pre-1923 while in Europe content is released per a seventy-year moving wall, i.e., currently only materials up to 1946 are widely available without restriction (2015). For content after those years, one must travel to the holding institution and view it within its physical network, assuming it has been digitized.

The situation comes into sharper focus when one considers the thousands of small and esoteric serial publications that find their way into libraries' collections via various programmatic or even happenstance means. Certain types of research libraries tend to describe their general scope of activity in geographical terms. In other words, they emphasize or prioritize materials and issues that have a tie to their specific local or regional

community. The Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, for example, houses a world-class collection that includes extensive materials from around the globe, but it also realizes a particular set of responsibilities to collect, preserve, and provide access to Bavarian materials. Much the same can be said about many national or state libraries as well as some larger academic libraries that assume this role either by design or by default for their state or region. As libraries digitize and enhance access to their newspaper collections, they tend, of course, to do so following this general pattern of emphasizing collections of "local" interest before others.

AuF and PVz represent a newspaper that simply escapes notice in such a system. It was published in Prague and so it would seem the purview of the Czech National Library to collect, describe, and digitize it. Yet it is a German-language newspaper and so that has not been the case. The Bayerische Staatsbibliothek collected it within the scope of its SSG obligations to Eastern Europe and "Slavic" materials, while the Staatsbibliothek collected it due to the particular nature of the GDR's relationships with its Socialist neighbours. Yet examining their respective newspaper digitization programs, digiPress and Dahlie, indicates that these programs emphasize Bavarian and Berlin newspapers. This emphasis makes sense, given their funding sources and the obligation to realize their role as the essential libraries for materials from within their geographic scope. Correspondingly, neither library has filmed or digitized AuF or PVz.

This is a single example, yet thousands of similar newspaper and periodicals similarly fall into the gaps that exist between the collecting and digitization practices of major libraries. This phenomenon can occur for a wide variety of reasons. Some are external to libraries, e.g., genocide, forced relocation, assimilation, political oppression, discrimination, etc. In some cases, borders shift or nations collapse, "stranding" minority groups in the process. These events and shifts result in what one could call "orphaned" newspapers, i.e., newspapers without an obvious organizational home in a library. Other reasons that libraries fail to collect esoteric periodicals include a lack of resources or staffing or result from institutional bias or negligence. Although collection policies often reiterate the neutrality of the library, staff may blithely overlook publications that emerge from communities they consider distasteful or irrelevant.

The digital era has not solved this issue. Sroka, in work somewhat similar to my own, documents minority newspapers and journals established *after* the fall of Communism in

Poland. He lists scores of titles, noting that most appear in very small runs intended to serve the needs of small communities (2004). Although Poland's National Library has a legal deposit requirement, searching for a sample of the titles Sroka identifies reveals that the National Library has complete or partial holdings for some titles, yet no evidence of others. This shows the limitations of legal deposit. For the editors of small, marginal publications it is likely not a priority to send two copies to the National Library. Conversely, the National Library clearly does not have the staff to identify and monitor every publication and pursue its deposit.

Preserve or Provide? Access and Use Policies

Even when materials successfully land in a library collection, researchers face other challenges when accessing and using certain materials. Generally stated, libraries and archives provide access to their materials; otherwise there would be no purpose in collecting them. Similarly, these institutions must also preserve their collections for future users. Library and archival preservation encompasses a wide set of practices based on criteria such as rarity, value, scholarly merit, and replaceability, which all factor into preservation policies and decisions.

The ability to access newspapers was critically necessary to conduct my research project. Newspapers in general represent an inestimably important primary source for historians and other scholars. In their original formats, they present a significant preservation challenge to libraries that has been long understood (Scribner 1934, 5). They are often large and folded, which makes them difficult to bind well. Newsprint comes in various grades, generally of lower quality paper than that used in most books. Bound newspaper volumes require unique shelving and quickly grow to consume excessive space. The first half of the previous century witnessed the rise of mass microfilming as a preservation technology to address the challenges presented by physically retaining newspapers. With microfilm, libraries could enable access to support most use cases by providing microfilm reels. Were these destroyed, libraries could make new prints from the microfilm masters, which were kept in secure storage and never circulated. As described earlier, many newspaper titles that had been reformatted to microfilm have now been digitized from these same masters.

Newspapers that have not, however, been digitized or filmed continue to present preservation challenges, compounded by our current emphasis on shrinking the physical footprint of our collections to create space for users and new activities. Based on my years in the profession, I can also report that many librarians uncritically assume that older newsprint is extremely fragile and disintegrates if used. While that may be true for paper that has been subjected to harsh conditions, if newsprint is stored properly, even in a degraded state it will last for decades, with a general life span of about 100 years (Tumosa et al. 2008, 21). As these researchers also point out, the notion that newspaper will disintegrate more readily is a myth that has been "encouraged by the preservation industry" (Ibid.). Nevertheless, many libraries have chosen to discard their paper newspapers, as they present a number of challenges in addition to their perceived fragility. They are bulky and difficult to handle, cannot be lent, require special equipment to make reproductions, and so forth. When libraries began discarding newspapers that had been digitized, the author Nicholson Baker became so incensed that he authored a book on the topic, *Double Fold: Libraries and the Assault on Paper*, excoriating libraries for what he considered their cavalier disposal of titles. While researching the topic, Baker founded the American Newspaper Repository, ultimately acquiring thousands of newspaper volumes, many deaccessioned from the British Library. In 2004, in a somewhat ironic turn, he negotiated the collection's move to the Duke University Library (Library Journal, 2004). While Baker's polemics won him few friends in libraries, his general point had merit, namely, that by discarding the originals of historical newspapers, libraries were discarding valuable historical sources. Microfilm surrogates may have the same textual information value, but lack, for example, the colour of the original. Given the technology of the era when filming was done at scale and the manual nature of the work, many microfilm surrogates also display poor image quality, making even reading a challenge. In such instances, originals would be invaluable for some research purposes.

Using Newspapers in Libraries

What anyone who has used bound newspaper volumes will report, however, is that it is not a uniformly pleasant experience. They must be used onsite, generally in a designated reading room, while there are often restrictions on what users may copy and reproduce, not least because the volumes do not fit on standard photocopiers. Moreover, there is the

lingering fear that the paper will disintegrate if used at all, despite research by Tumosa and others indicating that this is more hype than reality.

Using the example of working with AuF and PVz in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin in 1998-1999 for my own research, I will attempt to illustrate the challenges that the access policies that libraries place on newspapers present to researchers. Starting with size, the newspapers apparently either simply do not fit in the main buildings on Unter den Linden and Potsdamer Platz or the institution chooses not to prioritize keeping them in a central location. The library's newspaper volumes reside in a converted grain warehouse in Berlin's inland port, far from the city centre as well as from the library's main collections. As a remote unit, its hours were (and remain) short: essentially 9-5, Monday to Friday. In 1998-99 when I was working there, readers ordered volumes by submitting paper request slips onsite, with a modest cap on the number of volumes that one could request at one time. Volumes were retrieved only twice a day. Therefore, if one finished with a batch of volumes before the end of the day but after the last retrieval window, the remainder of the day was lost. These sound like petty concerns; taken singly, they perhaps are. Yet in sum they determine to a great extent the speed at which one can peruse a large amount of content. A researcher with, say, a two-week window at her disposal could not choose to work into the evening or on the weekend. While from an organizational perspective this might make sense—low demand for those hours would make them too expensive to maintain in light of other priorities—it fails to consider that if the volumes were made available in a reading room in a central location, they would be available for more hours.

Another significant and ultimately insurmountable challenge concerned reproductions. Given the task I had set myself to scan forty years of a newspaper for literary content, I had to move quickly to complete the task within the scope of the grant funding the work. It would have greatly enhanced the project if instead of merely recording the texts in a bibliography I had been able to capture the full text of each piece. Rekeying them would have taken an absurd amount of time and introduced error and therefore reproduction would have been the viable method to capture them. In 1999, however, digital photography was in its infancy and not yet a common consumer technology a graduate student could possibly afford. Even if one had had a digital camera, the policies at the time prohibited photography in general. In order to request a reproduction, a user had to submit a written request for each reproduction and pay a considerable fee per image. Given the thousands of

images that the literary works in the bibliography would have necessitated, it would have been prohibitively expensive to request their reproduction, as well as time-intensive to submit and track over a thousand requests. Even in 2017, the availability of inexpensive digital photography has not solved this issue. Although the current user policy permits the use of digital photography to make reproductions in the Staatsbibliothek's newspaper reading room, it does not permit the use of a tripod, which is necessary to make consistently sharp, high resolution photographs that would enable, for example, accurate and reliable text recognition. The library offers no rationale for the prohibition on tripods, which are fairly commonly used in other archives. The library still offers to make reproductions for a fee, but the base charge for a request is €10, with per page charges based on the size and condition of the item. The inability to make high quality scans using a personal digital camera and the cost of a reproduction request effectively discourage the user from making reproductions. The affordances that newer technology enables have not substantively altered the situation encountered in 1998. This has negative consequences on research productivity, in particular for newer forms of scholarship, a point I take up later in this chapter.

As outlined earlier, it was also necessary to travel to other libraries in order to view every issue of the newspaper from its launch in 1951 until the end of 1990. These trips allowed a glimpse into other institutions' practices with bound newspaper volumes. These practices did not differ significantly from those at the Staatsbibliothek, meaning that it was not possible to capture the text of the literary entries I found in those particular issues. At the Archive of the City of Ústí nad Labem / Aussig, where I was ultimately able to locate newspaper issues that had proved impossible to find in German collections, the volumes—which the Archive had acquired from the editorial offices of the newspaper when it ceased publication in 2006—were being stored in a non-climate-controlled bunker on shelving that was too narrow to support the volumes properly. The temperature in the bunker when I visited was sweltering, and the air was heavy with a musty, damp aroma. There was no reading room or even large table to use the volumes, so I opened them up on the floor. While I was grateful to have been granted access, I left concerned about the future fate of these unique volumes. Although, as noted, newsprint can survive decades or longer when properly bound, stored, and handled, this situation met none of those criteria.

Libraries' Impact on Scholarly Possibility

Each of these four areas of practice—collections development, description, digitization, and access provision—impacts the ability to conduct effective research for scholars for whom the library is a key source of primary and secondary materials. In some cases, any one of these factors or some combination of them can combine to make certain kinds of inquiry impossible to pursue. Scholars cannot consult materials that a memory institution has not collected and preserved. Materials collected but poorly described divulge their information, if at all, only after laborious and time-consuming effort on the part of library staff and researchers. Our policies and practices with regard to digitization and access intersect with other barriers, often resulting in an opaque, confusing screen between researchers and the record.

This is not an entirely new or unique insight, although also one not often repeated loudly by libraries as it would tarnish the image we wish to present to our communities and our funding bodies. Balsamo noted in 1990 that "to this day historical investigations of the institutional role of libraries in the spread of culture are inadequate, even though it is a role which clearly has close ties to book production and to the political and social conditions of different geographical areas," an assertion that would carry equal validity—if formulated somewhat differently to reflect the emergence of the public Internet—in 2017 (179). The technological revolution that the World Wide Web instigated and that innovations such as smart phones have only accelerated has fundamentally altered libraries and continues to do so. When Balsamo wrote in 1990, nearly the entirety of a research library's acquisitions budget would have been used for analogue materials: books, journals, manuscripts, and related materials. A generation later, virtually all research libraries have long passed the point where more than 50% of the budget is spent to license online content such as electronic journals and books; many libraries are rapidly approaching 100%, for reasons related to journal inflation and the emergence of scaled e-book packages.

The shift in collections spending has also occurred in libraries' personnel budgets. Original cataloguing, i.e., creating a new and unique bibliographic or metadata record for a purchased item, is no longer a priority in nearly all research libraries; accordingly, there has been a reduction in the number of cataloguers. As libraries have hired, for example, data librarians and technologists and moved to create and support units performing digitization

and other new centres of work, they have inevitably reduced their ranks of subject librarians, combining the intellectual breadth this work demands into fewer positions, or eliminating it entirely in favour of functional designations. While the new positions support some new types of inquiry and/or help scholars meet new demands, such as managing their publications and research data to meet funders' obligations, sacrificing subject expertise has had a negative impact on collection-intensive researchers, shifting the burden of collecting or identifying relevant resources from expert staff trained in the work to the researchers themselves. Even for scholars capable of performing these tasks successfully, the time burden associated with it slows their research progress; it can also consume their limited research funding. The decline in subject expertise is not a temporary dip on a curve; it is a permanent and profound shift in North American libraries.

To counteract this trend and to assert that they still meet their traditional obligations as repositories of the human record, libraries have tended to seek their salvation in technological solutions. Digitization and the resulting mass repositories of historical documents and images help create what one could call the attractive illusion that libraries are still emphasizing myriad fine aspects of the human record, but the reality is that budgetary imperatives mean that libraries no longer collect unique materials at anything resembling the earlier rate and that they no longer hire the staff expertise that such collections require to build, describe, and support, at least not at the scale that the work would actually require. Even in different financial times and before the technology wave, my research illustrates, libraries were not as comprehensive in their collecting and descriptive work as their policies and proclamations would have suggested. Given the current matrix of means and obligations, libraries have had no choice but to abandon to a great extent the "slow" and painstaking work required to build rich and detailed collections. It has thus become more likely that we will overlook the record of marginal cultures, not less.

There is no small irony in the fact that the person writing this analysis occupies a library role nearly entirely on the digital technology side of the equation just postulated. A major focus of my early career was intense involvement in collection development and providing expert service to students and faculty using the collections. In my current role, however, I have nearly nothing to do with collection development, description, or reference service, but rather direct the creation of digital repositories and other online services as well as the support for new initiatives such as digital scholarship and research data management. This

shift in my career focus was not accidental but entirely deliberate. Even while I occupied a role at a major private university in the United States that lavished money on its collections, it was clear that the "collections era" was approaching its end and that the future lay in digital and technical work. Yet my educational background led me to formulate, some twenty years ago and before I had entered the professional librarian ranks, the research project that led to this dissertation. While the arc of my work over those years tracks nearly perfectly—and predictably—the resource and emphasis shift in libraries, returning to this research from my current vantage point and drafting the previous points in this chapter has led me to reflect critically on how well or poorly we are continuing to serve as the guardian of the human record. In sum: not well.

This work originated as a library science topic, and I still see the bibliography I created both as a work of original research and scholarship as well as a tool intended deliberately to enable further research by others, a distinctly librarian view. In effect, I created a detailed finding aid for a scattered archival collection. What gives me pause, however, is the level of effort such work requires, and the fact that this type of scholarly librarian work within libraries is becoming increasingly rare as our institutions evolve to meet new and emerging needs in order to reestablish perpetually our relevance to our funding institutions. It is clear to me at the conclusion of this work that we are risking abandoning the critical work of collecting, describing, and providing access to the full diversity and complexity of the record of the communities we serve.

Others have observed this trend and highlighted our need to recognize and to counteract it. Underscoring how central this work is for making libraries useful (and how long this point has been understood), Balsamo notes that Léopold Constantin Hesse directed his 1839 book[80]—one of the first to articulate modern library principles—at "persons interested in making libraries functional" rather than booksellers and collectors, who pursue other aims. Balsamo further points out that a collection of books or materials without classification or arrangement is not a library (1990, 161). One could extend this argument to newspapers lacking indexes. Digitizing newspapers—should they even receive this treatment—solves only one problem, namely, geographical access. Other than mostly

[80] The work that Balsamo cites is *Bibliothéconomie, instruction sur l'arrangement, la conservation et l'administration des bibliothèques*. Paris: Techener, 1839.

crude keyword and phrase searching, it does not fully solve the problem of intellectual access. Anticipating this problem, Brookes declared,

> If what Shera called the "theory of bibliography" is not soon claimed by librarians and information scientists as properly their territory to develop, it seems unlikely that it will be claimed by anyone until much effort and expenditure have been wasted and much damage to humane values has been done by the inadequately designed, all-embracing, computerized systems that are now being planned. And it will then be too late for librarians to make the claim. (1973, 245)

Given the state of library technology in 1973, one must credit Brookes for his prescience. There is something troublingly prophetic in this statement, as if he foresaw an abdication of the need to create bibliographies, indexes, and other richly descriptive tools to support the spread of ideas and knowledge. We have massive systems now, but it remains open to debate whether they are actually useful to this end or perhaps instead limiting and controlling, or worse, entirely silent in response to some queries, either for lack of content or due to poor description. Balsamo, writing at the dawn of mass digitization, concluded that having text available in great quantities does not mean that selecting useful or relevant information becomes any easier (1990, 182). A generation later, many scholars and students would still affirm that statement's accuracy.

Facilitating New Modes of Inquiry

We are in the midst of a major transitional period with regard to textual and documentary scholarship, particularly in the humanities and in disciplines outside of the humanities that employ similar research methodologies. Most refer to this shift collectively as digital humanities, and while there are numerous debates as to what digital humanities means or even whether it is a useful or desirable construct, for my purposes here I sidestep those arguments. I gesture instead toward the innumerable research projects in the humanities that are working with materials at scale, using software to support analyses that human labour and energy could not realistically accomplish. Libraries increasingly recognize their role in supporting and facilitating these new forms of inquiries, as hundreds of library-based digital humanities or digital scholarship centres and libraries' hiring of librarians and staff to support these emerging research practices attest.

An inherent risk increasingly coming to light in the digital humanities is the potential such scholarship has to reinforce canons, whether intentionally or not. Digital analysis of a

scaled corpus requires de facto a large corpus. Given the tendency I have outlined for libraries to emphasize the digitization of "known" materials and topics from canonical sources, anyone wishing to pursue digital humanities work with less processed materials will discover that corpus creation is a major and often insurmountable hurdle.[81] As I have demonstrated with my project, for example, given the reproduction policies in the libraries that hold the materials I need, I was unable to gather the raw images that would have enabled me to create a textual corpus of the literature I studied. Even if I had such images, of course, the labour involved in creating that corpus would be significant, particularly with regard to the modest size and scale of the resulting corpus, which is a secondary challenge that many scholars face.

While within the digital humanities one sees projects that attempt to overcome these limitations by solving extensive logistical and/or technical challenges, many opt to use existing digital corpora as their objects of study, which as outlined here tends to reify canons rather than challenge them. While we are beginning to see various funding agencies support institutions that seek to digitize their "hidden" collections, the scale and scope of such work does not approach that related to major collections and works.[82] A scholar wishing to do textual analysis on any aspect of a Shakespeare's or a Goethe's oeuvre, for example, will not labour to create a corpus for this purpose, as there are multiple extant and easily available sources that would enable this work. The further one moves from the centre of such established canons, however, the amount of time and labour necessary to generate a digital source increases exponentially, with the labour shifting, moreover, from institutions to individuals. The impact that this has on scholarship is inevitable.

Conclusion and possible solutions

When working with users, particularly with those new to working in research libraries, librarians often emphasize the need to delimit the scope of a topic to avoid compiling an overwhelming quantity of information. With any archival or documentary research process, the need to maintain scope by limiting how broadly one searches always exists. It is simply

[81] cf. Jennifer Askey "Queen Luise of Prussia, a Digital Hagiography," presented at the 2015 DH conference in Sydney, Australia.
http://dh2015.org/abstracts/xml/ASKEY_Jennifer_D_Queen_Luise_of_Prussia__a_Digita/ASKEY_Jennifer_D_Queen_Luise_of_Prussia__a_Digital_Hagi.html

[82] E.g., the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) supports a *Hidden Collections* program with support from the Mellon Foundation. Cf. https://www.clir.org/hiddencollections

not humanly possible to follow every thread, consult every document, or pursue each angle. There are significant temporal, material, and practical limits that create a more or less rigid boundary around a topic.

With the project documented in this dissertation, this logic was somewhat inverted; while there were myriad aspects and threads worth pursuing, it turned out that the sheer lack of accessible documentary evidence made such pursuit impossible for most. The documentary record of this community's existence is scant, particularly with regard to that held by memory institutions whose task it is not only to preserve these materials but to provide access to them for the research community. Confronted with this inversion, which contradicted both my professional training as well as much of my experience working with researchers, led me to reflect upon whether I had encountered a rare anomaly or whether this situation might apply more broadly. As I have attempted to establish in this chapter, the latter often obtains when one conducts research on a community that sits firmly outside of an accepted mainstream, given the general processes and policies that bring collections into libraries. This circumstance suggests the need for a critical examination of the broadly accepted notion of libraries as guardians of the human record, not least when one considers the growing recognition of the inherent lack of neutrality in library practice as well as a sustained increase in scholarly interest in people, communities, and topics that have been and still are neglected by the mainstream. Libraries clearly have a specific role to play in helping tell the story of marginalized peoples and cultures, yet at present our ability to address these stories is uneven at best.

Given the real and pressing financial constraints on our institutions, how can we address this challenge? In the simplest terms, libraries will inevitably have to divert resources currently dedicated to supporting hegemonic cultures toward collecting and providing access to new stories and narratives. It is, to use a common refrain, a zero-sum game. Even if this redirection occurs, however, it will move us only so far in a new direction in the absence of new money or new approaches.

One possible solution that one should sensibly hesitate to suggest would be a collaborative approach to collecting such materials. The history of collaborative collection development contains more cautionary tales than success stories; institutions have a way of backing away from these collaborations when they impinge on their own imperatives or diminish what they consider to be their uniquely prestigious position. Given the financial

constraints all face as well as new affordances offered by technological change, we may now be in a better position to work collaboratively to close gaps in the record. Rather than all libraries trying to be all things to their users, perhaps we need to restrict the breadth of our vision and reemphasize depth. To recall the example of the Library of Congress presented earlier, such a turn would entail not collecting a publication, at all, unless the intent is to do so consistently. A related tactic would be for libraries to transfer partial runs of publications in their collections to other libraries with the goal of creating more intact runs. The downside would be loss of geographic diversity, but the advantages of better description and a complete record outweigh it. Organizations such as the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) were created generations ago to support such notions; perhaps as we seek to clear collections out of our buildings to create space for new functions we can reinvigorate these collaborative approaches to collection development and management.

Such a change would particularly impact print publications, of which many still exist decades into the Web era. With regard to digital publications, we have completely different possibilities that are only now coming into focus in libraries. We are seeing the emergence of technologies that can archive Web content in nearly completely automated fashion. While there are barriers to this work, not least the cost of storage, collectively libraries could currently be ingesting far more of this material than is currently the case. Web archiving is now emerging as an area of practice and discussion, a positive development that we should embrace and pursue. We also have examples such as the HathiTrust—a large repository of digitized books supported and maintained by research libraries—that demonstrate that we can replicate in the digital realm collaborative work such as that pioneered by CRL.

Last, libraries need to recognize that what one might call the “slow” work of libraries, such as the creation of finding aids and bibliographies, is not yet ready to be consigned to the dustbin of library history. Even if libraries collect the materials and provide adequate description, these steps alone will not clearly establish the many threads and links between disparate ideas and collections scattered around libraries and the world. Linked data and scaled digitization go a long way toward making such connections a reality, but we must acknowledge that at their root even they depend on human knowledge and effort, for example, in the form of authority records or through the use of information in sources such

as DBpedia, which is itself derived from millions of hours of human labour invested in the creation of structured and information-rich Wikipedia pages.

In other words, bibliography as a practice is perhaps not quite so obsolete, even if technophilic librarians such as myself sometimes wish it were otherwise.

Conclusion

The Legacy of the Expulsion

Traumatic upheavals and events often bring questions in their wake that ask if things could have gone differently or where we would be now if they had. There is, for example, an entire genre of novels speculating on what would have happened had the Germans not lost the Second World War. With regard to the expulsion of the majority of the German population from Czechoslovakia, the question of this type that most frequently arises is whether the Communist takeover in 1948 would have occurred had the Germans remained. I avoided even mentioning this matter in my second chapter. For one, the question is entirely speculative and my research sheds no new light on a possible answer. It is also precisely the kind of conversation that draws the attention and interest of scholars away from the fate of individuals and their lived experience.

As a concluding thought, however, I offer a personal perspective on the larger impact of the expulsion on the Czech nation and on the lands the Germans once occupied as a majority. A constant complaint that one hears from the Vertriebene community about their former homes is that the Czechs have destroyed everything that they, the Germans, built. This impression is difficult to counter. It is true that entire villages and even small towns have been abandoned and fallen into ruin. Even in those that have persisted, the physical decay is plainly visible, even seventy years after the war. A strange and slightly melancholy air still hangs over the borderlands. One can see the scars and traumas of the past written on the landscape.

Scholars in recent years have begun to turn their attention to this legacy. In particular, Wiedemann's *"Komm mit uns das Grenzland aufbauen!": Ansiedlung und neue Strukturen in den ehemaligen Sudetengebieten 1945-1952* and Glassheim's *Cleansing the Czechoslovak Borderlands: Migration, Environment, and Health in the Former Sudetenland* delve into the complicated process of resettlement and critically explore the Czechs' relationship with their own borderlands. The issues they raise and the conclusions they draw are not flattering. Reading Glassheim, in particular, one could almost come to the conclusion that the Czechs not only punished the Germans by throwing them out, but subsequently punished their lands by, in Glassheim's terms, using them as the setting for a social and industrial experiment. Much as with the common refrain that renters do not care as well for

property as do owners, the Czechs behaved as if the land were somehow not core to their identity and nation, but rather something to be exploited. It is true that reckless industrialization and environmental destruction occurred across Eastern and Central Europe under Communism, but the levels of pollution and environmental destruction in Northern Bohemia were excessive even by that standard. Glassheim concludes that "it became a worst-case scenario, short of mass murder and nuclear annihilation, of what Communism, indeed modernity itself, could produce" (2016, 120-21). Glassheim attributes much of what occurred to the influence of Communist officials and ideology, but his critical commentary on the complicity of the populace in these measures points toward an interpretation of it being a generally Czech phenomenon, not merely Communist.

Beyond the poisoning of the environment, the expulsion also poisoned the relationship between Germany and Czechoslovakia and continues to do so. Despite multiple post-1990 agreements and apologies, myriad unresolved issues negatively influence how Germany and the Czech Republic interact. The Federal Republic of Germany has a history of difficult relations with its neighbours given the Nazi past, but with many of those nations the major issues have long been resolved. The tense relationship between Czechs and Germans still stands out. The work of the joint historical commission contributes to better understanding between the two nations and the passage of time helps heal wounds as memory fades, but more remains to be done. In his earlier work, Glassheim saw the lingering effect that the Holocaust and the expulsion have had on Czech society, noting that the Czechs "still struggle with the troubling memories of their lost diversity" (2005, 230). One might better call "troubling memories" by a more precise name: guilt. One can question the sincerity and efficacy, but there is no denying that Germany has spent decades and considerable effort on reconciling with the Nazi legacy. The Czechs have taken only small steps in recent years to address the atrocity they perpetrated on their German population.

Resolving these issues will mean little for the small German community that remains in the Czech Republic. As community representatives have noted, discrimination toward the German community has abated, with the younger generation of Czechs showing ambivalence on the matter. This shift has largely resulted from the gradual disappearance of the German community, however, rather than from increased tolerance or acceptance in Czech society. As a representative of the Czech government acknowledged, Czechs suffer from a pronounced xenophobia. He attributed this attitude to their isolation during

Communism, which seems disingenuous and avoids acknowledging the Czechs' active role in homogenizing their society (Schultheis 2003). As the Verbliebene community passes into history, their experience and their story, in so far as they can be preserved, can serve as a useful reminder of the impact of intolerance and blind ethnic hatred.

Future Research Directions

As noted at various points in this dissertation, I was generally unable to locate primary source materials in archives and libraries related to Verbliebene organizations and individuals. I have therefore out of necessity constructed much of the narrative from my own notes and a scattering of other documents and accounts, mainly from journalistic or post-revolution government sources, such as the Czech government's reports on the status of its minorities. With regard to the notes gathered while scanning the newspaper for literature, I reiterate that these are "jottings" made on the side while I was pursuing another purpose. Had I recognized, when I embarked on the project in 1998, the extent to which the Verbliebene community is poorly documented, I might have proceeded differently. There are surely many more references to these issues in the newspaper than I recorded. That would have been, however, an entirely different research undertaking. As it was, it took the better part of a fully funded research year to scan forty years of the newspaper, carefully seeking out and recording literary pieces. A "political" reading based on close reading of the news content would surely take equally as long, if not longer.

I do not believe that there are no official records of this community. Intuition tells me that there must be government records related to the Kulturverband and to the newspaper, since both received government subsidies and were surely closely monitored by the Communist regime. The records of Státní bezpečnost (StB – the Czechoslovak internal security apparatus from 1945-1989) must contain copious information, since they surely spied on Germans as potential subversives. The StB records are being steadily digitized and put online. I hope the work I have done to construct a timeline and offer biographical details will allow others to travel further down that road. From my experience, strong facility with Czech language will be essential for anyone seeking to undertake this research. I visited various archival institutions in Prague accompanied by a Czech speaker, but even with a translator at hand it was impossible to impress upon the staff at these institutions the nature of the materials I sought or the probable fonds and collections in their institutions

that would contain relevant materials. Language facility will not only help a future researcher access these materials, it will be necessary to read Czech to use the materials. There is little to be gained at this point through interviews; all of the salient actors in the drama have passed away, leaving little legacy since their children are highly assimilated.

Perhaps with time the Czech attitude will further soften, and it will become possible for them to approach openly and critically this chapter of their history, not only in narrow scholarly circles as is currently taking place, but also in schools and in the media. If this change in attitude occurs, we may begin to see documents and accounts surface that would enable historians to delve more deeply into the lived experience of these neglected and forgotten people. Even within the Verbliebene community, the conflict between those perceived as hardline Communists and those who considered themselves victims of Communism that split the community after 1990 has created a situation where documents have remained in personal collections rather than being donated to institutions. The establishment of the Collegium Bohemicum is a positive step in this direction and future researchers should benefit if it can firmly establish itself as a reliable archive and secure sufficient funding for its work.

Although I was able to document a significant body of literary works, I believe that there are many more texts that never saw publication. From news items in the newspaper, letters to the editors, and interviews, I learned that there were unpublished books and thousands of pages of unpublished poetry and stories. This fact supports the assertion related to my first research question that there was a strong will and desire within the community to have a more vibrant literary life and that writing was a way for the Verbliebene to assert their identity and make sense of their lives post-expulsion. Accessing these materials will be challenging, since most of the authors are dead. Their families, many of whom speak Czech as a first language, may not value these materials or consider them worthy of inclusion in an archive or museum. As with archival research, facility with the Czech language would be critical for working with Czech-speaking descendants. It would be a challenging but potentially rewarding research project to pursue this type of material.

Digitization and Digital Humanities

My own future research interests involve capturing the corpus of literature I have documented in the bibliography and analyzing it using some of the tools and methods of

digital humanities. An ideal situation would see the entire newspaper from 1951 to 2006 digitized and indexed at the article level, but that scenario is unlikely to be realized in the near future, perhaps not even in my lifetime. Given that unlikelihood, a more modest approach would be to use the bibliography as a guide for requesting the relevant volumes of the newspaper and making digital images of all of the literary contributions, after securing special dispensation to do so using a tripod. This is a task that a relatively small grant could achieve by making use of student research assistants. I would then apply OCR processing to these images to create a textual corpus.

I have been able to get a sense of what this process might yield thanks to my recent discovery of the book *Mit siebenundzwanzig Federn: Kurzgeschichten, Reportagen, Skizzen und Verse* edited by Karl Havránek and published by Orbis in Prague in 1958. It mainly reprints literary texts from AuF that are recorded in my bibliography, with a handful of additional contributions. I secured a copy of this text, had it digitized, and then created a corpus by using OCR (with the native Adobe Acrobat OCR engine) and doing minimal cleanup. I then did some preliminary analysis of it using Voyant Tools. Even though it is a small corpus and I had done no encoding, the results were immediately intriguing. As I noted earlier, individually the texts do not yield much insight. They are often short, autobiographical, politically motivated, and/or simply a bit amateurish in approach. Collectively, however, one can quickly see patterns and themes that are not apparent at the level of an individual poem or story. With a larger corpus that has been properly corrected and encoded, one could apply more sophisticated analytical tools such as topic modelling or sentiment analysis. Given the lack of known documentary evidence of this community and these individuals, such analysis would enable me to offer more insight into what their texts reveal about the community and its identity.

Such a direction would also open up the possibility of understanding more about the community's inner dynamics. As I mentioned briefly at several points, cultural work split along gender lines. The national leadership of the Kulturverband was mostly male, while the local leadership was often female. The newspaper's editors were men, but many of the writers were women. Tagging the texts according to gender and other markers would allow me both to do further textual analysis with gender questions in mind as well as to see and interpret patterns in publication, i.e., who was published when. Having more textual evidence from the newspaper would also facilitate creating network graphs showing

relationships between individuals that could provide insight into connections not clear from a close reading of the newspaper.

Implications for Library Practice

As my final chapter makes clear, this research project alerted me to a larger issue in libraries, namely, flaws in our practices and habits with regard to marginal materials and communities. As a professional librarian and one who wishes to take on leadership roles in organizations and the profession, I have fundamentally shifted my views on the core role of libraries as a result of this realization.

We might characterize one endemic conflict in research libraries is as a struggle between our urge to do everything for everyone and our predilection for being extremely exacting with our work. Neither of these tendencies is wrong, exactly, but they are fundamentally incompatible in many ways. The analysis I offer in chapter four illustrates this inherent tension. On the one hand, I state that libraries need to realize the mandates set out by their collection policies and acquire materials more broadly representative of the diversity in their host communities. On the other hand, I assert that newspapers without accurate holdings records are essentially useless, which is a plea for the type of detailed metadata work that emerges from our desire to be exacting and precise. Given finite resources, we cannot just do more of both without consequences.

We need to find sustainable ways to achieve equilibrium between these two exigencies. Technology and automation would seem to offer potential solutions, and libraries have pursued many changes in recent years to make labour-intensive repetitive processes the work of machines rather than people. We need to do more in this area. We must also accept that some of the services we might consider essential based on their historical role are no longer necessary. Conversations on such topics often quickly turn adversarial, however, as various parts of the organization seek to defend their traditional role.

Rather than trying to resolve the conflict at the service level, it would seem potentially more fruitful to address it as a question of mission and vision and proceed from a shared understanding of what our role is, both within and across libraries. Do research libraries, collectively, still want to present themselves as the custodians of the human record? If so, we must clearly articulate that aim collectively and then communicate it as individual libraries through our mission statements. We must then express that mission in policy and

allow our actions to be guided consistently by these policies. This programF sounds simple, perhaps, but as my research has made clear to me, we have been failing in this regard. Doing better would mean, in many ways, doing less, i.e., no longer pretending that every research library can be all things for all people. The challenge of preserving the human record is simply too great to assume that it will happen through the uncoordinated actions of hundreds of libraries and their good intentions. The scale of the issue demands collective action and new strategies.

Works Cited and Consulted

Ahonen, Pertti. 2003. After the Expulsion: West Germany and Eastern Europe, 1945-1990. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

American Library Association. 2017. “Professional Ethics: Code of Ethics.” Text. Tools, Publications & Resources. May 19, 2017. http://www.ala.org/tools/ethics.

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.01609.

Askey, Dale. 2001a. “Prager Volkszeitung als Studienobjekt. US-Germanist auf den Spuren deutschsprachiger Literatur in der Tschechoslowakei nach 1945.” *Prager Volkszeitung*, May 11, 2001.

———. 2001b. “The German Minority in Czechoslovakia after the Expulsions,” October. http://hdl.handle.net/11375/20755.

Balsamo, Luigi. 1990. *Bibliography: History of a Tradition*. Berkeley: B.M. Rosenthal.

Beneš, Edvard. 1941. “The New Order in Europe.” *The Nineteenth Century and After* 130 (775):150–55.

———. 1942. “The Organization of Postwar Europe.” *Foreign Affairs* 20 (2):226–42. https://doi.org/10.2307/20029146.

Berger, Karina. 2015. *Heimat, Loss and Identity: Flight and Expulsion in German Literature from the 1950s to the Present*. Bern: Peter Lang.

Bernhardt, Rüdiger. 2005a. “Einführung.” In *Wanderer in den Morgen. Louis Fürnberg und Arnold Zweig*, edited by Rüdiger Bernhardt, 9–16. München: Martin Meidenbauer.

———. 2005b. “Utopien in Louis Fürnbergs Lyrik nach 1945.” In *Wanderer in den Morgen. Louis Fürnberg und Arnold Zweig*, edited by Rüdiger Bernhardt, 72–97. München: Martin Meidenbauer.

Beyerl, Beppo. 2002. *Die Beneš-Dekrete: zwischen tschechischer Identität und deutscher Begehrlichkeit*. Vienna: Promedia.

Biły, Łukasz. 2016. “Positive Entwicklung.” *Wochenblatt* (blog). July 21, 2016. http://wochenblatt.pl/positive-entwicklung/.

Bohmann, Alfred. 1968. “Die deutsche Restbevölkerung in der Tschechoslowakei.” *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 17 (2):344–48.

———. 1981. "'Leben wie auf einer Insel ...' Das Schicksal der Minderheiten in der Tschechoslowakei." In *Wege und Wandlungen: die Deutschen in der Welt heute*, edited by Peter E. Nasarski, 1:114–37. Berlin: Westkreuz.

Borchardt, Elisabeth. 1955. "In Nejdek spielte das Deutsche Schauspielensemble." *Neues Deutschland*, July 15, 1955. http://zefys.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/ddr-presse/ergebnisanzeige/?purl=SNP2532889X-19550715-0-4-60-0.

Bowers, Fredson. 1964. *Bibliography and Textual Criticism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Brookes, B.C. 1973. "Jesse Shera and the Theory of Bibliography." *Journal of Librarianship* 5 (4):233–45.

Brügel, Johann Wolfgang. 1957. "Die Stellung der deutschen Kommunisten." *Osteuropa* 7:555–58.

———. 1985. "Karl Kreibichs Bruch mit dem Kommunismus." *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 26 (2):386–91. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-1985-3231.

Bryant, Chad. 2002. "Either German or Czech: Fixing Nationality in Bohemia and Moravia, 1939-1946." *Slavic Review* 61 (4):683–706. https://doi.org/10.2307/3090386.

Buchsbaum, Thomas M. 2003. "Die 'Benes-Dekrete' - Ihre Bilateralen Und Multilateralen Aspekte." *Österreichische Militarische Zeitschrift* 41 (4):443–52.

Bundesministerium für Vertriebene, Flüchtlinge und Kriegsgeschädigte. 1957a. *Die Vertreibung der deutschen Bevölkerung aus der Tschechoslowakei. Dokumente*. Vol. 4.2. Dokumentation der Vertreibung der Deutschen aus Ost-Mitteleuropa. Berlin: Bundesministerium für Vertriebene, Flüchtlinge und Kriegsgeschädigte.

———. 1957b. *Die Vertreibung der deutschen Bevölkerung aus der Tschechoslowakei. Einleitende Darstellung*. Vol. 4.1. Dokumentation der Vertreibung der Deutschen aus Ost-Mitteleuropa. Berlin: Bundesministerium für Vertriebene, Flüchtlinge und Kriegsgeschädigte.

Cannon, Angela. 2015. "Bibliographies of East European Newspapers at the Library of Congress." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 16 (4):181–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228886.2015.1082822.

Čapková, Kateřina, Andreas Gotzmann, and Yfaat Weiss. 2005. "Czechs, Germans, Jews – Where Is the Difference? The Complexity of National Identities of Bohemian Jews,

1918–1938." *Bohemia - Zeitschrift Für Geschichte Und Kultur Der Böhmischen Länder* 46 (1):7–14. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-2005-1231.

Carlton, Robert G. 1965. "Newspapers of East Central and Southeastern Europe in the Library of Congress." Slavic and Central European Division, Library of Congress. http://lcweb2.loc.gov/service/gdc/scd0001/2010/20100111001ne/20100111001ne.pdf.

Carpen, Antony. 2017. "Why Digitising Local Newspapers Is Essential to Help Transform the Study of Local History." *Lost Cambridge* (blog). October 10, 2017. https://lostcambridge.wordpress.com/2017/10/10/why-digitising-local-newspapers-is-essential-to-help-transform-the-study-of-local-history/.

Center for Research Libraries. 2015. "The 'State of the Art': A Comparative Analysis of Newspaper Digitization to Date." Chicago: Center for Research Libraries. https://www.crl.edu/events/framing-common-agenda-newspaper-digitization-and-preservation-icon-summit.

Coffey, Amanda. 2014. "Analysing Documents." In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. SAGE. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243.n25.

Council for National Minorities of the Government of the Czech Republic. 2002. "Report on the Situation of National Minorities in the Czech Republic in 2001." Office of the Government of the Czech Republic: Council for National Minorities of the Government of the Czech Republic. https://www.vlada.cz/assets/ppov/rnm/dokumenty/dokumenty-rady/_report2001_.pdf.

———. 2003. "Report on the Situation of National Minorities in the Czech Republic in 2002." Office of the Government of the Czech Republic: Council for National Minorities of the Government of the Czech Republic. https://www.vlada.cz/assets/ppov/rnm/dokumenty/dokumenty-rady/_en_report2002_.pdf.

———. 2004. "Report on the Situation of National Minorities in the Czech Republic in 2003." Office of the Government of the Czech Republic Secretariat of the Government Council for National Minorities. https://www.vlada.cz/assets/ppov/rnm/dokumenty/dokumenty-rady/_en_report2003_.pdf.

———. 2006. “Report on the Situation of National Minorities in the Czech Republic in 2005.” Office of the Government of the Czech Republic Secretariat of the Government Council for National Minorities. http://www.mezikulturnidialog.cz/res/data/010/001216.pdf.

———. 2007. “Report on the Situation of National Minorities in the Czech Republic in 2006.” Office of the Government of the Czech Republic Secretariat of the Government Council for National Minorities. http://www.mezikulturnidialog.cz/res/data/010/001219.pdf.

Deegan, Mary Jo. 2001. “The Chicago School of Ethnography.” In *Handbook of Ethnography*, by Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn Lofland, 11–23. London: SAGE Publications. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781848608337.n1.

Der Spiegel. 1968a. “Tschechoslowakei: DDR-Kritik; Note eins,” April 1, 1968. http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-46094013.html.

———. 1968b. “Wieder Goethe,” November 4, 1968. http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-45935142.html.

———. 1972. “Biafra des Geistes,” November 13, 1972. http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-42805503.html.

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. 2016. “Richtlinien: Fachinformationsdienste für die Wissenschaft.” http://www.dfg.de/formulare/12_102/12_102_de.pdf.

Deutsche Welle. 2010. *Deutsche Nachkriegsopfer in Tschechien*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IP7YHxur19k.

Doerry, Martin, and Hans-Ulrich Stoldt. 2002. “‘Kisch hat uns alle inspiriert’.” *Der Spiegel*, 2002. http://www.spiegel.de/spiegel/print/d-25327110.html.

Dornemann, Axel. 2005. *Flucht und Vertreibung aus den ehemaligen deutschen Ostgebieten in Prosaliteratur und Erlebnisbericht seit 1945: Eine annotierte Bibliographie*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.

Drahotský, Walter. n.d. “[Verlagschronik].” Papers of the *Volkszeitung* editorial offices. Provided by I. Pavel.

“Dreimal klingeln. Ein heiteres Stück von Hans-Dieter Schmidt.” n.d. Fernsehen der DDR - Online Lexikon der DDR-Fernsehfilme, Fernsehspiele und TV-Inszenierungen. Accessed August 4, 2017.

http://www.fernsehenderddr.de/index.php?script=dokumentationsblatt-detail&id1=12829.

"Duke Acquires Newspaper Archive From Author Nicholson Baker." 2004. Library Journal. May 17, 2004. http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2004/05/ljarchives/duke-acquires-newspaper-archive-from-author-nicholson-baker/.

Earhart, Amy E. 2012. "Can Information Be Unfettered? Race and the New Digital Humanities Canon." In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/debates/text/16.

Earl, Jennifer, Andrew Martin, John D. McCarthy, and Sarah A. Soule. 2004. "The Use of Newspaper Data in the Study of Collective Action." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30 (1):65–80. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110603.

Eisch, Katharina. 1999. "Grenzland Niemandsland: Eine ethnographische Annäherung an die Deutschen in Böhmen." *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 40 (2):277–305. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-1999-1790.

Fiedler, Pit. 2006. "Die anderen Deutschen." *Der Freitag*, September 6, 2006, sec. Kultur. https://www.freitag.de/autoren/der-freitag/die-anderen-deutschen.

Filip, Ota. 1993. "Die Tschechoslowakei ist untergegangen – zu einem Nachruf auf ihre Geschichte aus sudetendeutscher Sicht: 'Es ist deutsches Land'." *Die Zeit*, January 15, 1993, sec. Kultur. http://www.zeit.de/1993/03/es-ist-deutsches-land/komplettansicht.

Foster, Nancy Fried, and Susan L. Gibbons. 2007. *Studying Students: The Undergraduate Research Project at the University of Rochester*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Fritz, Susanne. 2005. *Die Entstehung des "Prager Textes": Prager deutschsprachige Literatur von 1895 bis 1934*. Dresden: Thelem.

Fuchs, Albert, ed. 1941. *Die Vertriebenen: Dichtung der Emigration*. London: Free German League of Culture.

Fürnberg, Louis. 1963. "Abschied von Prag." In *Neue Texte; Almanach für deutsche Literatur. Herbst 1963*, 53–54. Berlin: Aufbau.

———. 1986. *Briefe 1932-1957: Auswahl in zwei Bänden*. Berlin: Aufbau.

Geertz, Clifford. 1975. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. London: Hutchinson.

Geissler, Cornelia. 2000. “Die Letzte: Sie hat mit F. C. Weiskopf zusammengearbeitet, mit Egon Erwin Kisch unter einem Dach gewohnt und war mit Anna Seghers befreundet; Lenka Reinerová ist eine deutsche Schriftstellerin aus Prag.” Berliner Zeitung. March 18, 2000. http://www.berliner-zeitung.de/die-letzte-sie-hat-mit-f--c--weiskopf-zusammengearbeitet--mit-egon-erwin-kisch-unter-einem-dach-gewohnt-und-war-mit-anna-seghers-befreundet--lenka-reinerovss-ist-eine-deutsche-schriftstellerin-aus-prag-lenka-reinerov%C3%A1-16559648.

Gerber, Jan. 2016. *Ein Prozess in Prag: Das Volk gegen Rudolf Slánský und Genossen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Germanistica Olomucensia III. 1973. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci.

Gilzmer, Mechtild. 2000. “Schließ dich den Juden an!” *Der Freitag*, March 24, 2000, sec. Kultur. https://www.freitag.de/autoren/der-freitag/schliess-dich-den-juden-an.

Glassheim, Eagle. 2001. “The Mechanics of Ethnic Cleansing: The Expulsion of Germans from Czechoslovakia, 1945-1947.” In *Redrawing Nations: Ethnic Cleansing in East-Central Europe, 1944-1948*, edited by Philipp Ther and Ana Siljak, 197–220. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

———. 2005. *Noble Nationalists: The Transformation of the Bohemian Aristocracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2016. *Cleansing the Czechoslovak Borderlands: Migration, Environment, and Health in the Former Sudetenland*. Pitt Series in Russian and East European Studies. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Glosiková, Viera. 2005. “Dramatische Arbeiten Louis Fürnbergs.” In *Wanderer in den Morgen. Louis Fürnberg und Arnold Zweig*, edited by Rüdiger Bernhardt, 43–56. München: Martin Meidenbauer.

Goldstücker, Eduard, ed. 1967. *Weltfreunde: Konferenz über die Prager deutsche Literatur*. Berlin: Luchterhand.

Gottzmann, Carola L, ed. 1991. *Unerkannt und (un)bekannt: Deutsche Literatur in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Tübingen: Francke.

Government of the Czech Republic. 2003. “Informationsbericht zur gegenwärtigen Lage der deutschen Minderheit in der Tschechischen Republik.” February 12, 2003. https://www.vlada.cz/cz/ppov/rnm/dokumenty/dokumenty-

rady/informationsbericht-zur-gegenwartigen-lage-der-deutschen-minderheit-in-der-tschechischen-republik-3779/.

Grub, Frank Thomas. 2010. “Grenz-Erfahrungen im Werk der Lenka Reinerová.” *Germanoslavica* XXI (1–2):171–89. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=189185.

Grubitzsch, Frank. 1990. “Fast vergessene Minderheit.” *Neue Zeit*, May 26, 1990. http://zefys.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/ddr-presse/ergebnisanzeige/?purl=SNP2532889X-19900526-0-14-291-0.

Gubrium, Jaber F., and James A. Holstein. 2014. “Analytic Inspiration in Ethnographic Fieldwork.” In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, edited by Uwe Flick. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243.n3.

Hanáková, Jitka. 1997. *Edice českého samizdatu 1972 - 1991*. 1. Prague: Národní Knihovna České Republiky.

Harmon, Robert B. 1998. *Elements of Bibliography: A Guide to Information Sources and Practical Applications*. 3rd ed. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Harner, James L. 2000. *On Compiling an Annotated Bibliography*. 2nd ed. New York: Modern Language Association.

Härtel, Hans-Joachim. 1981a. “Berichte zum kulturellen Leben in der ČSSR im Jahre 1980.” *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 22 (1):172–97. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-1981-3278.

———. 1981b. “Berichte zum kulturellen Leben in der ČSSR im ersten Halbjahr 1981.” *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 22 (2):428–46. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-1981-1588.

Havránek, Karel, and Rudolf Polák, eds. 1958. *Mit siebenundzwanzig Federn: Kurzgeschichten, Reportagen, Skizzen und Verse*. Prag: Orbis.

Herget, Toni. 1977. “Leserbriefe als Informationsquelle.” *Sudetenpost*, March 17, 1977. http://www.sudetenpost.eu/Archiv/1977/6.pdf.

Herzfelde, Wieland. 1967. *Der Malik-Verlag, 1916-1947: Ausstellung, Dezember 1966-Januar 1967*. Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Künste zu Berlin.

Hilf, Rudolf. 1964. “Die Stellungnahme der Komintern und der KPČ zur Frage der Deutschen in den Sudetenländern.” *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 5 (1):334–407. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-1964-2147.

———. 1965. “Radomír Luža: The Transfer of the Sudeten Germans. A Study of Czech-German Relations 1933–1962.” *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 6 (1):501–5. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-1965-2315.

———. 1971. “Die Deutschen in Der Tschechoslowakei.” *Osteuropa* 21 (7):502–16.

Hohmeyer, Andrea. 2002. *Böhmischen Volkes Weisen: Die Darstellung der deutschsprachigen Dichtung in den böhmischen Ländern der Jahre 1895 bis 1945 : Probleme und Perspektiven territorialer Literaturgeschichtsschreibung in Mitteleuropa*. Münster: LIT.

Honegger, Gitta. 2005. “Prague Writer Lenka Reinerová: Kafka’s Last Living Heir.” *Modernism/Modernity* 12 (4):659–77. https://doi.org/10.1353/mod.2005.0112.

Houžvička, Václav. 2015. *Czechs and Germans 1848-2004: The Sudeten Question and the Transformation of Central Europe*. Translated by Anna Clare Bryson-Gustová. Prague: Karolinum Press.

Hrabal, Bohumil. 1998. *Total Fears: Letters to Dubenka*. Translated by J. D Naughton. Prague: Twisted Spoon Press.

Hruška, Blahoslav. 2008. “Kneifel - Ein Porträt des Landespatrioten als alter Mann. Leben und Meinungen des letzten deutschen Holzfällers im Riesengebirge.” In *Die unbekannten Nachbarn: Minderheiten in Osteuropa*, edited by Ruth Leiserowitz, 130–39. Berlin: Ch. Links.

Hudalla, Anneke. 2004. “Der Kaiser von Usti.” *Sächsische Zeitung*, April 21, 2004. http://www.sz-online.de/nachrichten/der-kaiser-von-usti-611563.html.

Jäger, Christian. 2005. *Minoritäre Literatur: das Konzept der kleinen Literatur am Beispiel prager- und sudetendeutscher Werke*. Wiesbaden: Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag.

Kalmanach. 2015. “Berta Cibulková-Hannichová [obituary],” 2015. http://www.kruhautoruliberecka.cz/wp-content/uploads/2010/02/kalmanach_2014.pdf.

Kaplan, Robert B., and Richard B. Baldauf, eds. 2005. *Language Planning and Policy in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

King, Jeremy. 2002. *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848-1948*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kisch, Egon Erwin, Franz C. Weiskopf, Eduard Goldstücker, and Kurt Böttcher, eds. 1963. *Egon Erwin Kisch, F. C. Weiskopf: Leben und Werk*. Schriftsteller der Gegenwart 11. Berlin: Volk und Wissen.

Koch, Rainer. 1993. "Muttersprache stirbt. Deutschunterricht für Minderheit in den Sudeten." *Neue Zeit*, July 22, 1993. http://zefys.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/ddr-presse/ergebnisanzeige/?purl=SNP2612273X-19930722-0-6-81-0.

Köhler, Bruno. 1960. "Vyreseni nemecke otazky a nova ustava republiky." *Zivot strany* 16 (August):985–88.

Kokošková, Zdeňka. 2008. *Schicksale der vergessenen Helden: Dokumentation der Schicksale aktiver Gegner des Nationalsozialismus, die nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs in der Tschechoslowakei von den gegen die so genannte feindliche Bevölkerung ergriffenen Maßnahmen betroffen wurden*. Prague: Národní archiv.

Kreibich, Karel. 1968. *Těsný domov - širý svět*. Liberec: Severočeské nakladatelství.

Lange, Matthew. 2013. *Comparative-Historical Methods*. London: SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473914223.

Larivière, Jules. 2000. "Guidelines for Legal Deposit Legislation." Paris: UNESCO. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001214/121413eo.pdf.

Leiserowitz, Ruth. 2008. *Die unbekannten Nachbarn: Minderheiten in Osteuropa*. Berlin: Ch. Links.

Library of Congress. 2016. "The National Digital Newspaper Program (NDNP): Technical Guidelines for Applicants." https://www.loc.gov/ndnp/guidelines/NDNP_201719TechNotes.pdf.

Liebert, Herman W. 1974. *Bibliography Old & New*. Lew David Feldman Lectureship in Bibliography 3. Austin: Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin.

Luža, Radomír. 1964. *The Transfer of the Sudeten Germans: A Study of Czech-German Relations, 1933-1962*. New York: New York University Press.

Maidl, Václav. 2001. "Die Rezeption deutschsprachiger Autoren aus Prag in der Tschechischen Republik." In *Prag - Literatur, Geschichte und Kultur: Pragbilder deutschsprachiger Autoren; Beiträge für Unterricht und Weiterbildung*, edited by Alfred Schmidt and Haus der Heimat des Landes Baden-Württemberg. Filderstadt: Weinmann.

Maier, Erich. 1970. “Die deutsche Minderheit in der Tschechoslowakei.” *Der Donauraum* 15 (1–2):74–76. https://doi.org/10.7767/dnrm.1970.15.12.74.

Major, Gene R. 2002. “Beyond Bibliography: A Dynamic Approach to the Cataloging of Multidisciplinary Environmental Data for Global Change Research.” *Science & Technology Libraries* 23 (4):21–36. https://doi.org/10.1300/J122v23n04_03.

March of Time: Prelude to Conquest. 1938. Vol. 5.1. March of Time. New York: RKO Radio Pictures.

March of Time: The Soviet’s Neighbor Czechoslovakia. 1946. Vol. 13.3. March of Time. New York: 20th Century Fox.

Marek, Michaela J. 2010. “Einleitung.” In *Kultur als Vehikel und als Opponent politischer Absichten: Kulturkontakte zwischen Deutschen, Tschechen und Slowaken von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in die 1980er Jahre*, edited by Michaela J. Marek, Dušan Kováč, Jiří Pešek, and Roman Prahl, 1–14. Veröffentlichungen der Deutsch-Tschechischen und Deutsch-Slowakischen Historikerkommission 17. Essen: Klartext.

“Mariánské Lázně.” 2016. *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Mari%C3%A1nsk%C3%A9_L%C3%A1zn%C4%9B&oldid=750514729.

May, Tim, and Beth Perry. 2013. “Reflexivity and the Practice of Qualitative Research.” In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, edited by Uwe Flick. London: SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243.n8.

Mayo, Hope. 2002. “Newspapers and Bibliography: The Importance of Artifacts.” *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 96 (4):493.

McKerrow, Ronald B. 1967. *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McLaughlin, Daniel. 2005. “Czech PM and President Split over Apology to Anti-Fascist Germans.” The Irish Times. August 25, 2005. http://www.irishtimes.com/news/czech-pm-and-president-split-over-apology-to-anti-fascist-germans-1.484122.

McLaughlin, Donal. 1996. “Written in Britain: Publications by German-Speaking Literary Exiles in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.” In *Germans in Britain since 1500*, edited by Panikos Panayi, 95–112. London: Hambledon Press.

Meier, Jörg. 2001. “Deutschsprachige Schriftstellerinnen des 18.-20. Jahrhunderts aus dem Gebiet der heutigen Slowakei.” In *Vergessene Literatur, ungenannte Themen deutscher Schriftstellerinnen*, edited by Petra Hörner, 241–62. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Michaels, Jennifer E. 2001. “Franz Werfels Stellung zur Tschechoslowakei und zur tschechischen Kultur in seinen Essays, Reden und Tagebüchern.” In *Jugend in Böhmen: Franz Werfel und die tschechische Kultur; Eine literarische Spurensuche; Beiträge des internationalen Symposions in Budweis (České Budějovice) vom 12. bis 15. März 1998*, edited by Michael Schwidtal and Václav Bok, 175–87. Vienna: Edition Praesens.

Molloy, Peter. 2015. *1945: The Savage Peace*. United Kingdom: British Broadcasting Corporation.

Murchison, Julian M. 2010. *Ethnography Essentials: Designing, Conducting, and Presenting Your Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Národní knihovna v Praze. 1951. *Bibliografický katalog ČSR. Česká knihy*. Praha: Národní knihovna.

“Neuer Literaturpreis: Lenka Reinerova erhält Schillerring.” 1999. Spiegel Online. May 11, 1999. http://www.spiegel.de/kultur/literatur/neuer-literaturpreis-lenka-reinerova-erhaelt-schillerring-a-51111.html.

Neues Deutschland. 1968. “UPI: Prager ‘Volkszeitung’ verlor Chefredakteur,” September 24, 1968. http://zefys.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/ddr-presse/ergebnisanzeige/?purl=SNP2532889X-19680924-0-7-122-0.

Neumann, Rudolf. 1952. “Die Lage der Deutschtumreste im östlichen Mitteleuropa nach 1945.” *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 3:427–32.

Neustupný, J.V., and Jiří Nekvapil. 2005. “Language Management in the Czech Republic.” In *Language Planning and Policy in Europe: The Czech Republic, The European Union, and Northern Ireland*, edited by Robert B. Kaplan and Richard B. Baldauf. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Nohlen, Dieter, and Philip Stöver, eds. 2010. *Elections in Europe: A Data Handbook*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

“Opava.” 2016. *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Opava&oldid=754399668.

Palka, Franz. n.d. “Schneesturm.” Accessed December 1, 2016. http://vis.idu.cz/ProductionDetail.aspx?perf=44749&mode=0&tab=photo.

Pasch, Ralf, and Marco Zimmermann. “Fritz Schalek – als Verbliebener im Dienste der Minderheit.” Paper presented at the 17. Münchner Bohemisten-Treffen, Munich, March 8, 2013. http://www.collegium-carolinum.de/fileadmin/Veranstaltungen/BohemistenTreffen_Exposes/Exposes_2013/2013-15-Pasch-Schalek.pdf.

Patka, Marcus G. 1999. *Zu nahe der Sonne: deutsche Schriftsteller im Exil in Mexiko*. Berlin: Aufbau Taschenbuch.

Pešek, Jiří. 2010. “Zum Begriff der Kultur in Mitteleuropa. Eine Einführung.” In *Kultur als Vehikel und als Opponent politischer Absichten : Kulturkontakte zwischen Deutschen, Tschechen und Slowaken von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in die 1980er Jahre*, edited by Michaela J. Marek, Dušan Kováč, Jiří Pešek, and Roman Prahl, 31–37. Veröffentlichungen der Deutsch-Tschechischen und Deutsch-Slowakischen Historikerkommission 17. Essen: Klartext.

Petrnoušková, Jaroslava. 2012. “Die Tätigkeit der Verbände der deutschen Minderheit in der Tschechischen Republik, am Beispiel des Begegnungszentrums Reichenberg und Kulturverbands Maffersdorf in den Jahren 1989 - 1999.” Bachelorarbeit, Prague: Charles University. Repozitář závěrečných prací. https://is.cuni.cz/webapps/zzp/detail/100905/22358676/.

Piverka, Walter. 2014. “Die Anfänge der LandesZeitung.” January 21, 2014. http://landesversammlung.cz/de/neuigkeiten/lv-aktuell/141-die-anf%C3%A4nge-der-landeszeitung.

“Portrait of the Brod Family in Prague.” 1936. Photo Archives: United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Accessed January 19, 2017. http://digitalassets.ushmm.org/photoarchives/detail.aspx?id=1133841&search=&index=319.

Rabl, Kurt. 1957. “Die Rechtstellung der Deutschen in der Tschechoslowakei.” *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 6:180–210.

———. 1961. “Über die Verfassungsurkunde der ČSSR vom 11. Juli 1960.” *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 2 (1):511–44. https://doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-1961-2454.

Radke, Heinz. 1981. “Das Schicksal der Ost- und Osteuropa-Deutschen von 1945 bis heute.” In *Geflohen und vertrieben: Augenzeugen berichten : nach der Fernseh-Dokumentation Flucht und Vertreibung*, edited by Eva Bethold, Jost von Morr, Rudolf Mühlfenzl, and Fritz Peter Habel, 241–59. Königstein/Ts.: Athenäum.

Reiman, Michal. 2010. “Die Kafka-Konferenz von 1963.” In *Kultur als Vehikel und als Opponent politischer Absichten : Kulturkontakte zwischen Deutschen, Tschechen und Slowaken von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in die 1980er Jahre*, edited by Michaela J. Marek, Dušan Kováč, Jiří Pešek, and Roman Prahl, 107–13. Veröffentlichungen der Deutsch-Tschechischen und Deutsch-Slowakischen Historikerkommission 17. Essen: Klartext.

Reimann, Paul. 1951. *Über realistische Kunstauffassung*. Berlin: Dietz.

———. 1961. *Von Herder bis Kisch: Studien zur Geschichte der deutsch-österreichisch-tschechischen Literaturbeziehungen*. Berlin: Dietz.

———. 1969. “Über die Prager deutsche Literatur.” *Prager Volkszeitung*, September 5, 1969.

Reimann, Paul, Rudolf Popper, and Anna Maria Jokl, eds. 1944. *Stimmen aus Böhmen: eine Sammlung*. London: Verlag der Einheit.

Reindl-Mommsen, Margareta. 1967. “Die Sudetendeutschen in der Tschechoslowakei nach 1945.” *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 8 (1):315–24. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-1967-2103.

Reinisch, Leonhard. 1957. “Die Minderheitenpolitik in der heutigen Tschechoslowakei.” *Ostbrief: Mitteilungen der Ostdeutschen Akademie, Lüneburg* 2 (26):72–75.

Richter, Hans. 1937. *No Oppression of the Sudeten-Germans in Czechoslovakia? Czechoslovakians Reply to the Czechoslovakian Government*. Vienna: W. Braumüller.

Richter, Hans. 2005. “Louis Fürnberg - ein böhmischer Dichter.” In *Wanderer in den Morgen. Louis Fürnberg und Arnold Zweig*, edited by Rüdiger Bernhardt, 17–42. München: Martin Meidenbauer.

Robinson, Antony Meredith Lewin. 1971. *Systematic Bibliography: A Practical Guide to the Work of Compilation*. 3rd ed. Hamden, CT: Linnet Books.

Roche, Reinhard. 1973. “Sprachliche Beobachtungen bei der Lektüre der ‘Prager Volkszeitung.’” In *Zum öffentlichen Sprachgebrauch in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und in der DDR: Methoden und Probleme seiner Erforschung*, 293–330.

Sprache der Gegenwart 18. Düsseldorf: Schwann. http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bsz:mh39-17884.

Rosenblum, Brian. 2008. “Digital Access to Cultural Heritage and Scholarship in the Czech Republic.” *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 9 (1):12–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228880802104637.

Sadler, Bess, and Chris Bourg. 2015. “Feminism and the Future of Library Discovery.” *The Code4Lib Journal*, no. 28 (April). http://journal.code4lib.org/articles/10425.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. 2003. *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Scheibe, Siegfried. 1978. *Aufbau: Berlin 1945 - 1958: Bibliographie einer Zeitschrift*. Analytische Bibliographien deutschsprachiger literarischer Zeitschriften 10. Berlin: Aufbau.

Schmidt, Hans-Jörg. 1992. “Deutsches Dach für die Diaspora. Schwierige Gründung einer Landesversammlung in tschechischen Ländern.” *Berliner Zeitung*, November 10, 1992. http://zefys.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/ddr-presse/ergebnisanzeige/?purl=SNP26120215-19921110-0-8-97-0.

Schmied, Erich. 1985. “Zvara, Juray: Nationalitätenpolitik der ČSSR.” *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 26 (1):192–94. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-1985-455.

Schneider, Georg. 1961. *Theory and History of Bibliography*. Translated by Ralph Robert Shaw. New York: Scarecrow Press.

Schock, Ralph. 1984. “Der Reporter des Saarkampfes. Bemerkungen zu Leben und Werk Theodor Balks.” In *Hier spricht die Saar: Ein Land wird interviewt*, i–xvi. Sankt Ingbert: Röhrig.

Schubert, Gerald. 2005. “Martin Dzingel über die ‘Landesversammlung der Deutschen in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien.’” Radio Prag. December 12, 2005. http://www.radio.cz/de/rubrik/mikrophon/martin-dzingel-ueber-die-landesversammlung-der-deutschen-in-boehmen-maehren-und-schlesien.

Schultheis, Silja. 2003. “Minderheiten in der Tschechischen Republik (1).” Radio Prag. February 18, 2003. http://www.radio.cz/de/rubrik/kaleidoskop/minderheiten-in-der-tschechischen-republik-1.

Scribner, Bourdon Walter. 1934. *Preservation of Newspaper Records*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Seibt, Ferdinand. 1997. *Deutschland und die Tschechen: Geschichte einer Nachbarschaft in der Mitte Europas*. 3. Aufl. Munich: Piper.

———. 2002. *Deutsche, Tschechen, Sudetendeutsche: Analysen und Stellungnahmen zu Geschichte und Gegenwart aus fünf Jahrzehnten; Festschrift zu seinem 75. Geburtstag*. Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum 100. Munich: Oldenbourg.

Simon, James T. 2009. "World Newspaper Archive." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 10 (1):82–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228880902756443.

Sliva, Katrin. 2003a. "Minderheiten in der Tschechischen Republik (5): Die deutsche Minderheit." Radio Prag. April 29, 2003. http://www.radio.cz/de/rubrik/kaleidoskop/minderheiten-in-der-tschechischen-republik-5-die-deutsche-minderheit.

———. 2003b. "Minderheiten in der Tschechischen Republik (6)." Radio Prag. May 13, 2003. http://www.radio.cz/de/rubrik/kaleidoskop/minderheiten-in-der-tschechischen-republik-6.

Smelser, Ronald M. 1996. "The Expulsion of the Sudeten Germans: 1945–1952." *Nationalities Papers* 24 (1):79–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/00905999608408428.

Smith, Maria. 2015. "Framing a Common Agenda for Newspaper Digitization and Preservation: An ICON Summit Report and Outcomes." Chicago: Center for Research Libraries.

———. 2016. "'At Risk': An Analysis of Newspaper Source Materials Digitized by U.S. and European Repositories." Chicago: Center for Research Libraries.

Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands, ed. 1948. *Protokoll der Verhandlungen des Ersten Kulturtages der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands: 5. - 7. Mai 1948 in der Deutschen Staatsoper zu Berlin*. Berlin: Dietz.

Sroka, Marek. 2004. "Periodicals of Ethnic Minorities in Poland." *Slavic & East European Information Resources* 5 (1/2):123–43. https://doi.org/10.1300/J167v05n01_12.

"Stadtarchivar Kaiser: Die Explosion in Usti nad Labem am 31.7. 1945 wurde von einem Tschechen organisiert." 2000. Radio Prag. August 1, 2000. http://www.radio.cz/de/rubrik/tagesecho/stadtarchivar-kaiser-die-explosion-in-usti-nad-labem-am-317-1945-wurde-von-einem-tschechen-organisiert.

Staněk, Tomáš. 1991. *Odsun Němců z Československa 1945-1947*. Prague: Academia - Naše vojsko.

———. 1993. *Německá menšina v českých zemích: 1948-1989*. Prague: Institut pro Středoevropskou Kulturu a Politiku.

———. 2003. *Verfolgung 1945: Die Stellung der Deutschen in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien (ausserhalb der Lager und Gefängnisse)*. Vienna: Böhlau.

———. 2005. *Poválečné "excesy" v českých zemích v roce 1945 a jejich vyšetřování*. Prague: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny.

Sudetendeutsche Landsmannschaft. n.d. "Unsere Geschichte im Überblick." Accessed February 16, 2017. http://www.sudeten.de/cms/?Historie:Unsere_Geschichte.

Sudetenpost. 1965. "Tscheche redigiert deutsche Zeitung," May 21, 1965. http://www.sudetenpost.eu/Archiv/1965/10.pdf.

———. 1971. "Lenk übt Kollgen-Beschimpfung," May 7, 1971. http://www.sudetenpost.eu/Archiv/1971/9.pdf.

"Šumperk." 2017. *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=%C5%A0umperk&oldid=762775083.

Tampke, Jürgen. 2003. *Czech-German Relations and the Politics of Central Europe: From Bohemia to the EU*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

The Office of the Czech Republic Government. n.d. "National Minorities Press." The Office of the CR Government. Accessed November 29, 2003. http://www.vlada.cz/1250/eng/vrk/rady/rnr/cinnost/tisk/nartisk.en.htm.

"Some Shifting." 1943. *The Voice of Austria* 2 (10):6–7. http://anno.onb.ac.at/info/voa_info.htm.

Tsaaior, James Tar. 2012. "Negotiating Nationhood through the Ethnography of Literary Series." World Literature Today. March 2012. http://www.worldliteraturetoday.org/2012/march/negotiating-nationhood-through-ethnography-literary-series-james-tar-tsaaior.

Tumosa, Charles S., David Erhardt, Kathy Hufford, and Evan Quasney. 2008. "The Deterioration of Newsprint and Implications for Its Preservation." *WAAC Newsletter* 30 (3):21–24. http://cool.conservation-us.org/waac/wn/wn30/wn30-3/wn30-305.pdf.

Turnwald, Wilhelm Karl. 1951. *Dokumente zur Austreibung der Sudetendeutschen*. München: Selbstverlag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft zur Wahrung Sudetendeutscher Interessen.

Úřad vlády České republiky. n.d. “Tisk národnostních menšin České republice.” Úřad vlády České republiky. Accessed November 29, 2003. http://www.vlada.cz/1250/vrk/rady/rnr/cinnost/tisk/nartisk.il2.htm.

Urban, Rudolf. 1965. “Zur Situation der Deutschen in der heutigen Tschechoslowakei.” In *Nachbarn im Osten: Wandlungen und Erkenntnisse in zwei Nachkriegsjahrzehnten 1945-1965*, edited by Peter Nasarski, 61–71. Leer: Rautenberg.

Urzidil, Johannes. 1969. “Rückblick auf die tschechisch-deutsche Kultursymbiose.” *Prager Volkszeitung*, August 8, 1969.

“Ústava Československé republiky 1948.” 1948. Parlament České republiky, Poslanecká sněmovna. 1948. http://www.psp.cz/docs/texts/constitution_1948.html.

“Ústava Československé socialistické republiky 1960.” 1960. Parlament České republiky, Poslanecká sněmovna. 1960. http://www.psp.cz/docs/texts/constitution_1960.html.

“Ústavní zákon ze dne 27. října 1968 o československé federaci.” 1968. Parlament České republiky, Poslanecká sněmovna. 1968. http://www.psp.cz/docs/texts/constitution_1968.html.

Vondráček, David. 2011. *Töten auf Tschechisch*. https://archive.org/details/TtenAufTschechisch.

Wall, Renate. 2004. *Lexikon deutschsprachiger Schriftstellerinnen im Exil 1933-1945*. Giessen: Haland & Wirth.

Weise-Standfest, Hilde, and Horst Görsch, eds. 1953. *Die Tschechoslowakei erzählt*. Berlin: Volk und Wissen.

Wernimont, Jacqueline. 2013. “Whence Feminism? Assessing Feminist Interventions in Digital Literary Archives.” *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 7 (1). http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/7/1/000156/000156.html.

Wiedemann, Andreas. 2007. *“Komm mit uns das Grenzland aufbauen!”: Ansiedlung und neue Strukturen in den ehemaligen Sudetengebieten 1945-1952*. Veröffentlichungen der Deutsch-Tschechischen und Deutsch-Slowakischen Historikerkommission 15. Essen: Klartext.

———. 2010. “Kulturpolitik als Mittel gesellschaftlicher Integration in den Grenzgebieten der böhmischen Länder 1945-1953.” In *Kultur als Vehikel und als Opponent politischer Absichten: Kulturkontakte zwischen Deutschen, Tschechen und Slowaken von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in die 1980er Jahre*, edited by Michaela J. Marek, Dušan Kováč, Jiří Pešek, and Roman Prahl, 49–65. Veröffentlichungen der Deutsch-Tschechischen und Deutsch-Slowakischen Historikerkommission 17. Essen: Klartext.

———. 2010b. “Zur Problematik von Migration und Integration in den Grenzgebieten der böhmischen Länder nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg.” *Bohemia - Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der böhmischen Länder* 50 (1):3–22. http://dx.doi.org/10.18447/BoZ-2010-2470.

Wilkens, Matthew. 2012. “Canons, Close Reading, and the Evolution of Method.” In *Debates in the Digital Humanities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. http://dhdebates.gc.cuny.edu/debates/part/5.

Willig, Carla. 2013. “Interpretation and Analysis.” In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, edited by Uwe Flick. London: SAGE Publications. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243.n10.

Willoughby, Edwin Eliott. 1957. *The Uses of Bibliography to the Students of Literature and History*. Hamden, CT: Shoe String Press.

Witte, Michaela. 2002. *Entfremdung - Sprachlosigkeit - Aussöhnung? Deutsch-tschechische Verständigungsprobleme in der Vertreibungsfrage (vyhnání a odsun) der Sudetendeutschen im Spiegel ausgewählter deutscher und tschechischer Presseorgane (1984 - 1997)*. Norderstedt: Books on Demand.

“World Newspaper Archive | CRL.” n.d. Accessed May 30, 2017. https://www.crl.edu/collaborations/global-resources-partnerships/news/world-newspaper-archive.

Zahra, Tara. 2008. *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1948*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Zahra, Tara. 2011. *The Lost Children: Reconstructing Europe’s Families after World War II*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zayarnyuk, Andriy, and Srdja Pavlovic. 2001. “Old Myths, New Rites? Notes on the International Conference ‘Nationalist Myths and Pluralist Realities in Central Europe’

at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, October 26-27, 2001." *Spaces of Identity* 1 (4). http://www.yorku.ca/soi/Vol_4/_HTML/zajarniuk-pavlovic.html.

Zimmermann, Marco. 2011. "60 Jahre deutschsprachige Publikationen in der Tschechoslowakei: Von 'Aufbau und Frieden' zur 'Prager Zeitung.'" Radio Prag. October 1, 2011. http://www.radio.cz/de/rubrik/geschichte/60-jahre-deutschsprachige-publikationen-in-der-tschechoslowakei-von-aufbau-und-frieden-zur-prager-zeitung.

Zimmermann, Volker. 2010. "Zwischen Kooperation und Konfrontation. Kulturpolitische Beziehungen zwischen der SBZ/DDR und der Tschechoslowakei in den 1950er und 1960er Jahren." In *Kultur als Vehikel und als Opponent politischer Absichten : Kulturkontakte zwischen Deutschen, Tschechen und Slowaken von der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts bis in die 1980er Jahre*, edited by Michaela J. Marek, Dušan Kováč, Jiří Pešek, and Roman Prahl, 67–94. Veröffentlichungen der Deutsch-Tschechischen und Deutsch-Slowakischen Historikerkommission 17. Essen: Klartext.